

LEGAL & GENERAL ASSURANCE SOCIETY LIMITED.

Head Office:

10, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4.

Near Temple Bar.

Estd.



1836.

Trustees

THE RIGHT HON. SIR ARTHUR CHANNELL,
THE RIGHT HON. LORD BLANESBURGH,
ROMER WILLIAMS, Esq., D.L., J.P.
CHARLES P. JOHNSON, Esq., J.P.

Subscribed Capital - - - £1,000,000
Paid-up Capital - - - £160,000
Assets exceed - - - £15,500,000

ALL CLASSES OF INSURANCE
TRANSACTIONED, EXCEPT MARINE.

General Manager:

W. A. WORKMAN, F.I.A

The Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter.

(ESTABLISHED IN 1857.)

LONDON, AUGUST 9, 1924.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION, PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

£2 12s.; by Post, £2 14s.; Foreign, £2 16s.

HALF-YEARLY AND QUARTERLY SUBSCRIPTIONS IN PROPORTION.

*. The Editor cannot undertake to return rejected contributions, and copies should be kept of all articles sent by writers who are not on the regular staff of the JOURNAL.

All letters intended for publication must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

GENERAL HEADINGS.

CURRENT TOPICS	861	SOCIETIES	870
THE UNDERLETING OF PROTECTED		STOCK EXCHANGE PRICES OF CERTAIN	
HOUSES AS FURNISHED	863	TRUSTEE SECURITIES	873
ON SOME POINTS OF CUSTOMARY		JURIES A HUNDRED YEARS AGO	873
DESCENT	864	THE DEPARTURE OF THE AMERICAN	
REVIEWS	865	LAWYERS	874
BOOKS OF THE WEEK	865	THE POSTPONEMENT OF THE LAW OF	
CORRESPONDENCE	865	PROPERTY ACT	874
IN PARLIAMENT	868	LEGAL NEWS	874
NEW ORDERS, &c.	870	WINDING-UP NOTICES	875
		BANKRUPTCY NOTICES	875

Cases Reported this Week.

Beaumont v. Jeffery	867
Black v. Admiralty Commissioners	866
Commissioners of Inland Revenue v. Fisher	867

Current Topics.

The Death of an American Visitor.

WE VERY MUCH regret to see the account in Thursday's *Times* of the death of Mr. JOHN JEFFERSON CAMPBELL, of Pittsburg, Kansas, who came here, with his brother, Mr. PHILIP CAMPBELL, of Washington, on the occasion of the visit of the American Bar Association. Mr. CAMPBELL, who was one of the leading lawyers in the State of Kansas, and had been a member of the Association since 1905, desired, it seems, to trace out what he could of the London that DICKENS knew and portrayed, and, last Sunday, in visiting the river bank at Wapping, he accidentally slipped on some old wooden stairs and fell into the water and was drowned. It is unfortunate that the happy memories of the American visit should be marred by this event.

Some Presidents of the American Bar Association.

WE FIND THAT we made a mistake in describing Mr. MOORFIELD STOREY, of Boston, who spoke at the first of the dinners given at Lincoln's Inn to the American Lawyers, as the first President of the American Bar Association. We misunderstood information to that effect we received from one of the visitors. On referring to the list of Presidents in the Association's Report for 1923, we see that the first President was the late JAMES O. BROADHEAD, of St. Louis (1878-79). The oldest surviving President is Mr. SIMEON E. BALDWIN, of New Haven, Connecticut, who was President in 1890 to 1891. The next survivor is Mr. MOORFIELD STOREY (1895-96). Other surviving Presidents include Mr. FRANCIS RAWLE, of Philadelphia (1902-03), Judge ALTON B. PARKER, of New York (1906-07), Mr. FREDERICK W. LEHMANN, of St. Louis (1908-09), and there are the familiar names of Mr. FRANK B. KELLOGG (1912-13), Chief Justice W. H. TAFT (1913-14), Mr. ELIHU ROOT (1915-16), Mr. HAMPTON L. CARSON, of Philadelphia (1919-20), and Mr. John W. DAVIS (1922-23). The President for 1923-24 was Mr. R. C. L. SANER, of Dallas, Texas. Mr. RAWLE, Judge PARKER, Mr. LEHMANN and Mr. SANER were among the visitors.

The New R.S.C.

TWO SETS of Provisional Rules of the Supreme Court, dated 18th July, have been issued. They are certified as urgent, and

will come into operation on 12th October next. One set relates to Patents and Designs, and re-drafts R.S.C. Ord. 53A so as to make it apply to the Patents and Designs Acts, 1907 and 1919, instead of applying only, as it now stands, to the Act of 1907, and there are also some further changes. The other set makes changes in Orders 16, 55 and 55B, the chief effect being to regulate proceedings in certain cases under s. 9 of the Air Navigation Act, 1920, which deals with trespass, nuisance and responsibility for damage, and appeals under the Industrial Assurance Act, 1923. We hope to print the Rules next week.

The Law of Property Consolidation Bills.

WE NOTICED last week, as we went to press, the introduction by Lord HALDANE of the Law of Property Bills, but it appears to be one thing to introduce and another thing to print them, and the Bills have not yet been issued. We are not surprised, for though in substance they must have been ready for a long time past, it is no doubt difficult to make the last corrections and adjustments in a scheme of legislation which, for size, is perhaps without parallel. At present, therefore, we have nothing but the names of the Bills as announced by the Lord Chancellor to guide us. There is to be a Law of Property Amendment Bill, and this will make the changes required in the Act of 1922, preparatory to its being dismembered and absorbed in the various Consolidating Bills. That such amendment would be required Lord BIRKENHEAD foretold when the Act of 1922 was passed. Two years' consideration has no doubt revealed weak spots, and there were some parts—notably s. 3, the "curtain section"—which required overhauling. And then there are to be a Law of Property Consolidation Bill, which presumably will incorporate the Conveyancing Acts, as amended, and five other Consolidation Bills, the nature of which appears from their titles—Settled Land, Trustee, Land Charges, Land Registration, and Administration of Estates. It is not clear where parts V and VI of the 1922 Act, dealing with the Copyhold Enfranchisement, will come in. Possibly they will be left as the relics of that Act. We considered recently, *ante*, pp. 626, 642, 657, 679, 714, 731, the amendments made by the Act of 1922 in the Land Transfer Acts, and it will be interesting to see the amended system of registration in its complete form; complete, that is, as regards statutory enactment; but it will rest to a large extent on rules, and we hope the Registrar will see that the draft new rules are published without delay.

Colonial Stocks as Trust Investments.

MR. J. M. KEYNES, in a lecture last Saturday before the Liberal Summer School at Oxford on "Foreign Investment and National Advantage," questioned the policy of bringing Indian and Colonial Stocks within the list of trustee investments. Originally the investments open to a trustee were determined by the practice of the Court of Chancery, and this severely restricted investment to Government securities. In Lord ELDON's day, even Bank Stock was not available. "Bank Stock," said Lord ELDON, in *Howe v. Dartmouth*, 7 Ves., p. 150, "is as safe, I trust and believe, as any Government security; but it is not Government security; and therefore this court does not lay out, or leave, the property in Bank Stock; and what the court will decree it expects from trustees and executors." But in the middle of the last century this exclusiveness began to be broken down, and the range of permissible trust investments was gradually widened, and the list up to 1893 was settled by s. 1 of the Trustee Act of that year; but it did not go beyond Government and certain other securities in the United Kingdom, and Indian Government securities and Indian Railway securities guaranteed by the Government of India. Then came the Colonial Stock Act, 1900, which brought Colonial Stocks registered in the United Kingdom under the Colonial Stocks Acts 1877 and 1892, within the list, provided they complied with any conditions the Treasury might prescribe, and the result has been to make a large number of Colonial Stocks eligible as trustee investments.

Mr. Keynes' Criticism.

MR. KEYNES raises a warning against this policy on two grounds, first, that the security cannot always be regarded as good, and secondly, that capital is attracted abroad to the prejudice of home industries. The result, he says, is that money for harbour works in New South Wales is obtained more cheaply than for harbour works in the Port of London which are not within the trustee category. And he advocates the repeal of the present statutory lists, and the conferring on the Treasury of a power to license investments. The Treasury, he says, should then use its powers of licensing to widen the list of admissible home investments—presumably by including industrial investments—and strictly to ration overseas borrowers. The suggestion raises economic considerations which are outside our scope, but if, as *The Times* financial writer says in commenting on the matter (*Times*, 6th inst.), the Colonial Stock Act was passed for political and not economic reasons, the present system may well require reconsideration, though the expediency of bringing investments under the control of the Treasury is very much open to criticism. It should be added that a trustee is not at liberty to invest in a Colonial Stock merely because it is authorized. He must bring his own judgment to bear on its soundness, though as long as the market price is suitable at the time of investment, he incurs no real risk.

Privileges of the Peerage.

DURING THE recent discussion as to the admission of peeresses to the House of Lords, one noble lord remarked that the only civil privileges still possessed by peers are two: first, they cannot be tried by jury for felony or treason, and secondly, if they are convicted of murder they are beheaded, not hanged. This last privilege, if it can be called one, does not exist and, indeed, never existed. Peers have always been liable to the same punishments as Commoners, although it was usual in treason cases to substitute beheading for "hanging, drawing, quartering, and disembowelling," in the case of male peers, and for "burning" in the case of female peers, as a special act of royal clemency. No such grace, however, was conceded to a peer convicted of murder. Except during the Commonwealth only one instance is recorded of a peer's execution for murder, that of Lord FERRERS, who on 5th May, 1760, was hanged at Tyburn for the murder of his steward. The crime had taken place three years previously, and there is little doubt that FERRERS was a madman, but public opinion insisted on his execution. The poor madman asked for, and was allowed to wear, his wedding dress at the execution; he was also permitted the service of his own landau and six of his own horses to draw him from his prison—not Newgate but the Tower—to Tyburn. Whether Lord FERRERS' madness would have passed through the meshes of the "MacNaghten Rules," we should scarcely like to say; but it is quite certain that in our own more humane age he would not have been hanged.

Diplomatic Protection.

THERE HAS been some public criticism of M. HERRIOT's attitude in addressing a letter to Mr. MACDONALD requesting a careful consideration of VAQUIER's case, with a view to the exercise of the prerogative of mercy, if any doubt exists as to the merits. This criticism would be justified if M. HERRIOT had interfered by addressing any legal tribunal, either before or after VAQUIER's conviction, but no such objection on grounds of International Law or Practice exists in requesting purely administrative action. On the contrary, where the citizens of one Sovereign State have been subjected to legal penalties in another under circumstances which arouse sentiments of doubt in the minds of their fellow-nationals, diplomatic representations and requests for information are quite usual. This form of diplomatic intervention has a special name given to it in textbooks of International Law, namely, the "Remedy of Diplomatic Protection," and a standard treatise on this branch of International Law was published in 1914 by Professor PAUL BORCHARD,

a disting
the innu
alone suc
relations
and Ame
request
stances
Apparent
through
Ambassa
State wh
informal
not quite

The Hon

IN THE
tion of re
of Ambul
failed to
On the a
dismissed
policy an
any court
observed
or undert
if a certai
other serv
an unlaw
to the dig
produce o
No court
awarded v
that the l
at an earl
the proce
corroborat
officials b
Wallace, 1
conditional
where his
such that
bribery of
case migh
I think, b

A Summ

WE SUG
a useful s
Summer S
barristers,
students n
recreation
teachers gi
the legal p
common i
many of th
for particu
many priv
Conservati
The great a
modelled o
ago at Cha
is that the
profession
possible for
teachers he
the broader
Law Societ
School, for
new "Appr
and many

a distinguished American jurist. In this work are fully discussed the innumerable precedents that exist, the limits within which alone such intervention is permissible without breach of amicable relations, and the proper procedure to be adopted. Both England and America have frequently made such representations, with requests for information and consideration of special circumstances, to other great Powers during the past century. Apparently, however, such representations are properly made through the usual diplomatic channels—namely, a letter from the Ambassador of the suppliant State to the Foreign Minister of the State whose tribunals have exercised jurisdiction. M. HERRIOT'S informal letter to Mr. MACDONALD is short-circuit action of a kind not quite in accordance with formal precedents.

The Honours Case.

IN THE ACTION for the recovery of £3,000, paid in the expectation of receiving the honour of Knighthood (*Parkinson v. College of Ambulance and Another*, *Times*, 1st inst.), the plaintiff has failed to secure the £3,000 damages awarded to him by the jury. On the argument of the points of law involved the action was dismissed, on the ground that the contract was against public policy and one which could not be sanctioned or recognised in any court of justice. LUSH, J., in the course of his judgment, observed: "I cannot feel any doubt that a contract to guarantee or undertake that an honour will be conferred by the Sovereign, if a certain contribution is made to a public charity, or if some other service is rendered, is against public policy, and, therefore, an unlawful contract to make. Apart from being derogatory to the dignity of the Sovereign who bestows the honour it would produce or might produce most mischievous consequences. . . . No court could try such an action and allow such damages to be awarded with any propriety or decency." It seems unfortunate that the legal effect of the contract could not have been decided at an early stage of the proceedings with a view to shortening the proceedings. The experience of the plaintiff seems to corroborate the view indicated as to the integrity of responsible officials by WARRINGTON, L.J., in *Re Wallace: Champion v. Wallace*, 1920, 2 Ch., at p. 290—a case where a gift, under a will, conditional upon the donee becoming a baronet, was held valid—where his lordship said "If the state of the public morality were such that the donee might be induced to obtain the title by direct bribery of those whose duty it is to advise the Crown, then the case might be different, but, happily, such an attempt may, I think, be regarded as out of the question."

A Summer School of Law.

WE SUGGESTED a year ago that The Law Society would render a useful service if it were to institute in the Long Vacation a Summer School of Law in some important rural centre, where barristers, solicitors, magistrates, academic teachers of law, and students might have an opportunity of combining a fortnight's recreation with attendance on courses conducted by distinguished teachers giving up-to-date information on matters important to the legal profession. Such Summer Schools are now becoming common in many branches of professional or social vocation; many of the Provincial Universities have accepted responsibility for particular schools, such as Economics or Geography; and many private bodies now run schools of this kind, e.g., the Conservative Party, the Liberal Party, and the Fabian Society. The great advantage of these new additions to our academic life—modelled on the great American experiment of two generations ago at Chautauqua, which, however, had a semi-religious bias—is that they bring together men in different walks of the same profession who would not otherwise meet, and they make it possible for the average busy practitioner to hear distinguished teachers he would not otherwise meet and get some insight into the broader and deeper aspects of his professional studies. The Law Society has peculiar advantages for undertaking such a Law School, for it is in touch with a mass of local centres owing to its new "Approved Law School" policy; it has an organisation ready, and many able tutors available from its headquarters in Bell

Yard, and it could bear the financial risk involved in a new policy more easily than academic institutions faced with a diminution in the real value of their endowments owing to the fall of purchasing power. May we venture once more to offer this suggestion for benevolent consideration?

The Underletting of Protected Houses as Furnished.

A POINT of considerable importance, with regard to the application of the Rent Restrictions Acts, has been decided by the Court of Appeal in *Prout v. Hunter*, *Times*, 31st ult., a decision which is certain to have far-reaching effects. In that case a landlord had let unfurnished a dwelling-house to which the Rent Restrictions Acts applied. The tenant furnished the house and sub-let it furnished. In an action for possession by the landlord against the tenant the landlord contended that the premises were no longer protected, by reason of the sub-letting of the premises furnished. The sub-letting, obviously, was not within the Acts, and the point before the Court was whether the original letting to the tenant, which admittedly was at one time protected, had lost this protection, by reason of the sub-letting. Judge PARRY held that the tenancy was nevertheless protected, but the Divisional Court reversed him. On appeal the Court of Appeal affirmed the decision of the Divisional Court, and held that the original tenancy was no longer protected.

The question before the Court was one of no little difficulty, and if one turns to the relevant sections in the Acts it will be observed that they are not of much assistance in elucidating the point. Now s. 12 (2) of the Act of 1920 provides: "This Act shall apply to a house or a part of a house let as a separate dwelling . . . Provided that . . . (i) this Act shall not, save as otherwise expressly provided, apply to a dwelling-house *bond fide* let at a rent which includes payment in respect of board, attendance or the use of furniture." The Acts, it should be observed, do not apply at all to premises let at a rent which includes payments in respect of board and attendance, but in the case of furnished premises, a small measure of protection to the tenant is afforded by ss. 9 and 10 of the Act of 1920, these sections limiting the landlord's rights in respect of the rent which he may be entitled to charge. In the case of furnished premises, therefore, no restriction is placed on the landlord's right to recover possession of the premises.

The basis of the decision of the Court of Appeal in *Prout v. Hunter*, *supra*, shortly put, amounts to this: In an action for recovery of possession of premises the nature of the tenancy of the occupying tenant, at the time of action brought must be regarded, in order to determine the question whether the Rent Restrictions Acts apply to the premises or not. But it is not clear why, if this principle is correct, it should be limited to actions for possession, and, carrying the decision to its logical conclusion, it appears correct to say that in any action or in any application, where there is an averment that the Rent Restrictions Acts apply, it is necessary to examine the status of the premises at the time when the action is brought or the application is made, and for this purpose it is necessary to determine the nature of the letting to the tenant who is in actual occupation.

It may, indeed, be truly said that the effect of the decision of the Court of Appeal in *Prout v. Hunter*, will not only be to decontrol a great many houses, but also to give to landlords an opportunity of raising successful defences to actions brought by the tenant against them for the recovery of overpaid rent in respect of premises which are alleged to be within the Rent Restrictions Acts. Thus, for instance, assume that a landlord has let, unfurnished, premises to which the Acts apply at a rental beyond the amount which he is legally entitled to charge under the Acts, and that the tenant subsequently sub-lets the premises furnished to a sub-tenant. According to the present decision of the Court of Appeal the premises are not within the Rent Restrictions Acts,

so that the landlord might successfully maintain an action for possession against his tenant, at any rate while the premises are sub-let furnished. If, then, the provisions with regard to eviction contained in the Rent Acts do not apply in such a case, it must be equally true to say that no other provisions in the Rent Acts can apply. The result of this would be that if the tenant brought an action to recover overpaid rent against the landlord in respect of a period during which the premises were sub-let unfurnished, the landlord would have a complete answer to the tenant's claim, and might successfully maintain that as the premises were not within the Acts during the period they were sub-let furnished, the Acts ceased to apply to the original tenancy as well, and that therefore he, the landlord, was legally entitled to charge during this period whatever rent he desired, and the same principles would apply to any other action or any application brought or made on the basis that the Acts applied to the premises in question.

What in effect the Court of Appeal has said, is, that in every case the position of the occupying tenant of the premises is to be regarded, in order to determine the status of the premises, and if the occupying tenant is not protected, the premises are not protected, nor is any other tenancy which might otherwise have been protected.

But it is difficult to see how this view can be correct. Reverse the position and take a hypothetical case. Assume that A lets a house furnished to B, B removes some of the furniture from part of the house and sub-lets that part to C unfurnished. According to *Prout v. Hunter* that part is within the Rent Restrictions Acts, and the sub-tenant of that part would be protected not only against his own landlord and the tenant, but even against the landlord of the tenant! Reference should be made to s. 15 (3) of the Act of 1920, which is as follows:—

"Where the interest of a tenant of a dwelling-house to which this Act applies is determined either as the result of an order or judgment for possession or ejectment, or for any other reason, any sub-tenant to whom the premises or any part thereof have been lawfully sub-let, shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, be deemed to become the tenant of the landlord on the same terms as he would have held from the tenant, if the tenancy had continued."

If the status of the part is to be determined by the nature of the letting to the tenant in occupation, the part, according to *Prout v. Hunter*, is protected, not only as between the sub-tenant and the tenant, but also between sub-tenant and all persons, including of course the landlord of the tenant. This surely is not a result that the Acts could have contemplated and, it is submitted, that in every case the question of the application of the Acts must be considered as between the particular landlord and tenant, so that if A lets premises within the Acts to B unfurnished, and B sub-lets the premises furnished to C, B will be able to invoke the protection of the Acts against A, but C will be unable to invoke their protection against B.

Another criticism apparently to be levelled against the decision in *Prout v. Hunter* is that the provision of s. 6 of s. 12 of the Act of 1920 was never brought to the notice of the Court, that sub-section being to the effect, that where the Act has become applicable to any dwelling-house, it shall continue to apply thereto whether or not the dwelling-house continues to be one to which the Act applies. It might be urged therefore that in any event by reason of the above sub-section, the original unfurnished tenancy was not taken out of the Act, by reason of any alteration in the nature of the tenancy under which the premises were actually occupied by the sub-tenant at the time in question.

Attention should be drawn to another decision of equal importance, that of the Divisional Court in *Hicks v. Scardale Brewery, Ltd.* 1924, W.N., 189. That decision is to the effect that a statutory tenant cannot claim the protection of the Acts, if he is not in actual occupation of the premises. If that decision is correct, a consideration of the nature of the letting to the tenant in actual occupation will be irrelevant in most cases, inasmuch as the landlord would be entitled to an order against his tenant where the tenant had sub-let the premises, and it would be immaterial whether the premises had been sub-let furnished or not.

On the other hand, there may be cases to which *Hicks v. Scardale Brewery, Ltd.* would not apply, viz.: cases where there is a subsisting lease or agreement in force between the landlord and tenant. If, in such a case, the tenant sub-lets the premises furnished, he would, according to a strict interpretation of *Prout v. Hunter*, lose the protection of the Acts, for all purposes, so that not even the provisions in the Acts with regard to the restrictions on increase of rent would apply.

In view therefore of the importance of the decision in *Prout v. Hunter*, and of the revolutionizing effect it is likely to have, it is to be hoped that the opinion of the House of Lords will eventually be taken on the question.

On Some Points of Customary Descent.

(Continued from p. 840.)

III.

Again, JOHN SMITH is found to have died intestate seised of freehold or copyhold in fee subject to the custom of Borough English, or custom of that nature—which it will be remembered carries descent only to the youngest son. The position is, he leaves surviving an eldest son, PETER, but he had a younger son, HUGH, who has predeceased him and even his acquisition of the land in question; but HUGH leaves living at his father's death an eldest son JAMES and a younger son JOSEPH. JOSEPH, as we apprehend, will be the customary heir, and take the land, in exclusion both of his brother JAMES, and his uncle PETER. We deduce this from the authority cited in the note, where the only child, a daughter of the predeceased younger son, took.⁴⁷

But the only particular customs of descent of which the courts take judicial cognisance are gavelkind and Borough English, and customs of these respective natures. Other special customs such as descent to eldest or youngest daughter, sister, niece, etc., or to younger brother, nephew, uncle, cousin, etc., have in each case to be proved specially. What then about representation in such case?

Here, we think, that we must in the case of such special customs, distinguish between descent of freehold and descent of copyhold. We submit that in case of freehold no custom, however clearly expressed, excluding representation *mutatis mutandis* to one who if surviving would be customary heir, could be valid.⁴⁸ Thus, suppose the custom proved that a surviving sister could exclude the son of a predeceased brother, we submit such custom would be void, as repugnant to the nature of fee simple.

The following case is verbatim taken from *ROLLE*⁴⁹:—

"If the custom be that if a man dies without heir male" [(?) of his body]⁵⁰ "that his eldest daughter shall have the land, and if he has no daughter his eldest sister shall have the land, and if he has no sister, his eldest cousin, but if he has heir male" [(?) of his body] "he shall have it before any of them, and if the tenant of the land has divers daughters, and no heir male" [(?) of his body] "and the eldest daughter dies in the life of the tenant of the land having issue a daughter, this grandchild is within the custom, and shall have the land by descent on the death of her grandfather."

Here we see that the only daughter of the predeceased elder daughter excludes entirely her aunts; but we shall see that had the case been one of copyhold descent, as the custom did not expressly extend to eldest granddaughter, the descent would have been in coparcenary at common law to the granddaughter and her aunts. We infer then that this was a case of descent of freehold—(*ROLLE* does not say that it was descent of a copyhold, and referring to another case in para. 1 he does say that that case was of a copyhold)—and that the granddaughter was within the custom, in this sense, that the law would not allow representation to be excluded.

(47) *Clements v. Scudamore*, 2 Ld. Raymond, 1024 (copyhold); and see comments in *Hook v. Hook*, *supra*; *Doe d. Hamilton v. Clift*, and *Rider v. Wood*, *supra*, on that case.

(48) *Locke v. Colman*, 2 M. & Cr., p. 636; and see *The Tenantry Case* cited, *supra*; *Newton v. Shaflo*, cited, *supra*.

(49) *Godfrey & Bullock, Rolle Abr. : Descent*, p. 623, pl. 3.

(50) See *The Tenantry Case*, cited, *supra*.

For the daughter le elder of the

But as t provided it it seems cl exclude al would have affirmative justifying of such exc

Where th and the son against the not that sh surviving s but was th the son of a that consec her nephew contention happily v precedent u of a predece succeeded.

Assuming excluding c has predece representati customary l to succeed a carried, or 58 him not qu the custom i

Thus, wh daughter, b had uncles

youngest so under the c eldest son o

So, where but not to a

a brother v survived, b eldest, who

SPRAY, her intestate lea

ANN SPRAG common law

the custom, daughter.

entirely as c have had to

niece, but al

(51) See *Locke*

(52) *Doe d.*

(53) *Doe d.*

having to go to

(54) As wou

cited, *supra*, b

(55) *Re Sma*

(56) *Denn d.*

(57) *Doe d.*

12 Ad. & E. 56

p. 624, pl. 2.

Portraits SOLICITORS' Mr. E. W. W. Wood. Copi be obtained,

For the same reason we infer that had the elder predeceasing daughter left two daughters, MARY and ELIZABETH, MARY, as the elder of the two, would have excluded her sister.

But as to *copyholds* we have seen that any custom of descent, provided it be clearly proved, will be valid; but, nevertheless, it seems clear, that for one whom we will call a junior heir to exclude *altogether* the representative of one who, if surviving, would have been senior heir, such junior heir must expressly and affirmatively prove a custom in clear and express terms or facts justifying such exclusion.⁵¹ The writer has found no instance of such exclusion being in fact proved.

Where the custom clearly proved descent to the eldest sister, and the son of the predeceased eldest sister claimed the entirety against the younger surviving sister, the latter's contention was *not* that she, as only surviving sister and consequently eldest surviving sister, was entitled as *customary heir to the entirety*; but was that, as the custom did not extend to giving the land to the son of a predeceased eldest sister, the custom was at an end, that consequently the common law applied, and that she and her nephew took at common law in coparcenary.⁵² With her contention the court would have agreed, but that the nephew, happily for him, was able to give from the Court Rolls one clear precedent uncontradicted by other evidence, of descent to son of a predeceased eldest sister against a surviving sister, and so succeeded.

Assuming, then, that the junior heir is unable to prove such excluding custom, the result is clear, that when the senior heir has predeceased leaving a representative, the existence of that representative is enough to exclude the junior heir claiming as customary heir; but nevertheless for such representative himself to succeed as customary heir he must prove that the custom has carried, or⁵³ at all events by reputation will carry, the estate to him *not qua* representative, but as it were directly; otherwise the custom is at an end, and common law descent will apply.⁵⁴

Thus, where the custom was descent to youngest son or daughter, brother or sister, uncle or aunt, and the intestate had had uncles and aunts all of whom had predeceased him, the youngest son of the youngest uncle failed to prove his right under the custom, and descent was as at common law to the eldest son of the eldest uncle.⁵⁵

So, where the custom clearly gave descent to an eldest daughter, but not to an eldest niece,⁵⁶ and the intestate died having had a brother who would have been his customary heir had he survived, but which brother had three daughters, ELIZABETH, eldest, who predeceased the intestate, leaving the defendant SPRAY, her eldest son; MARY, second, who also predeceased the intestate leaving a child, ANN GOODWIN, one of the plaintiffs; and ANN SPRAGG, third, the other plaintiff; the descent went in common law coparcenary. The brother had never been within the custom, so ELIZABETH could not have claimed as his eldest daughter. This was enough to defeat SPRAY's claim to the entirety as customary heir; but to obtain the entirety, he would have had to prove extension of the custom, not only to an eldest niece, but also to the son of a predeceased eldest niece.⁵⁷

(To be continued.)

(51) See *Locke v. Colman*, 1 M. & Cr., p. 420; 2 M. & Cr., p. 43, 636.

(52) *Doe d. Hamilton v. Clift*, 12 Ad. & E. 566.

(53) *Doe d. Foster v. Sisson*, 12 East, 62., as to evidence of reputation having to go to the jury though the Court Rolls are silent.

(54) As would have been the case in *Doe d. Hamilton v. Clift*, *supra*; cited, *supra*, but for the son's proof of extension to him of the custom.

(55) *Re Smart*, 18 Ch. D. 165 (Manor of Singleton).

(56) *Denn d. Goodwin v. Spray*, 1 T.R. 466 (Manor of Bolsover).

(57) *Doe d. Foster v. Sisson*, 12 East, 62; *Doe d. Hamilton v. Clift*, 12 Ad. & E. 566; *Rolle Abr. : Descent*, pl. 1, p. 623; *Ratcliffe & Chapman*, p. 624, pl. 2.

Portraits of the following Solicitors have appeared in the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL: Sir A. Copson Peake, Mr. R. W. Dibdin, Mr. E. W. Williamson, Sir Chas. H. Morton and Sir Kingsley Wood. Copies of the JOURNAL containing such portraits may still be obtained, price 1s.

Reviews.

Maritime Law.

THE RULES OF THE ROAD AT SEA, Comprising the Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, 1910, and Rules in Force in Harbours, Rivers, and Inland Waters, with Explanatory Notes and Observations. By HUBERT STUART MOORE and NORMAN DUNCAN, M.C., Barristers-at-Law. Fourth Edition. J. D. Potter, Admiralty Agent for Charts, 1922.

This edition of "The Rules of the Road at Sea," presents in very convenient form the Collision Regulations of 1910, printing the Regulations themselves in distinctive type, and following up each Regulation with explanatory notes based either on practical considerations or on judicial construction. Thus, under Art. 16, which directs that "every vessel shall, in a fog, mist, falling snow, or heavy rainstorms, go at a moderate speed, having careful regard to the existing circumstances and conditions," there is a reference to *The Counsellor*, 1913, P. 72, in which Bargrave Deane, J., on the advice of the Elder Brethren, adopted the rule—perhaps fairly obvious—that you ought not to go so fast in a fog that you cannot pull up within the distance you can see; and in *The Germanic*, *Times*, 22nd February, 1896, Gorell Barnes, J., referred to the Rule as most salutary. "The safety of life and property in thick weather at sea, and especially in narrow and crowded waters, depends largely upon a strict compliance with its provisions." There is, as the authors say, obvious reason for Art. 20, which directs that "when a steam vessel and a sailing vessel are proceeding in such directions as to involve risk of collision, the steam vessel shall keep out of the way of the sailing vessel"; and by virtue of the Preliminary Article, which provides that the word "steam vessel" shall include any vessel propelled by machinery, the Rule applies to any vessel which is proceeding through the water by means of mechanical propulsion, whether steam, oil, or electricity. But the Collision Regulations and Notes occupy only a fifth of the book. The great part is given up to Local Rules, arranged geographically in alphabetical order, with a prefatory note in each case showing the authority under which the Rules are made. Thus the Rules for the Port of Preston (River Ribble), 1893—for "Proud Preston" made itself into a port some fifty years ago at no slight expense—are bye-laws made by the Corporation of Preston by virtue of the various Ribble Navigation Acts from 1883 to 1892, and the Harbours, &c., Clauses Act, 1847, and sanctioned by the Board of Trade. The Portsmouth Rules are on a different basis, and are made by Order in Council under the Dockyard Ports Regulation Act, 1865, and the Lake Windermere Rules are made by Order in Council under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894. Altogether there are a great number of sets of local rules. The Order in Council of 1910 (reprinted in 1919) establishing the Collision Regulations is given at the end of the volume. The book has been prepared with great care and thoroughness and will be found useful by the amateur yachtsman as well as by seamen.

Books of the Week.

Company Law. Company Law: a Practical Handbook for Lawyers and Business Men. By Sir FRANCIS BEAUFORT PALMER. Twelfth Edition by ALFRED F. TOPHAM, LL.M., K.C., Assisted by ALFRED R. TAYLOR, M.A., Barrister-at-Law. Stevens & Sons, Ltd. 25s. net.

Minnesota Law Review. June, 1924. Minneapolis, Minn. \$3.00 per annum. 60c. per current number.

Correspondence.

Marking Counsel's Fees.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter.]

Sir,—May I call attention to the following questions put last Monday in the House of Commons to the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, and his answers:—

"Mr. T. Johnston asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury how many counsel were briefed in addition to the Attorney-General for the prosecution in the recent trial of Vaquier: and what sums each counsel, including the Attorney-General, so engaged received?"

"Mr. Graham: I am informed that three counsel were engaged, in addition to the Attorney-General, at the trial of Vaquier. The question of remuneration has not been settled yet, but as soon as it is settled, I will let my hon. Friend have the figures."

"Mr. Johnston: Is it not the case that the fees to be charged are marked on every brief?"

"Mr. Graham: I understand not."

"Major Hore-Belisha: Is the Attorney-General paid by results?"—*Hansard*, Vol. 176, page 2521.

It would seem from the above that the Attorney-General and the three eminent leading and junior counsel briefed with him in the Vaquier murder trial went into court with their briefs unmarked, and without any arrangement with the instructing Treasury Solicitors as to the amount of the fees payable, and that they are now higgling and haggling over the figure. I am given to understand that this is not an unusual proceeding in the case of the Law Officers of the Crown, but surely it is contrary to the etiquette of the Bar? I presume the attention of the Bar Council will be called to the matter and it will be interesting to hear their comments. Something clearly should be done when it is possible for the question to be asked: "Is the Attorney-General paid by results?"

FREDK. HINDLE.

House of Commons,
6th August.

[We proposed to call attention to the matter, but Mr. Hindle has done this for us. It is no doubt the rule that fees should be marked before counsel appears in court, though the rule is not strictly observed.—Ed., S.J.]

Small Tenements Recovery Act.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter.]

Dear Sir,—Under s. 1 on proof of the applicant's case, the justices may issue a warrant for giving possession within a period to be therein named not less than twenty-one days or more than thirty clear days from the date of the warrant.

In the Notes to "Stone," 1924 Edition, page 922, it is recommended that the safer course is to frame the warrant so as to authorize possession to be given at a period not earlier than after the expiration of twenty-one days nor later than thirty days from the date of the warrant. These proceedings are civil proceedings.

Should the applicant have reason to suppose that it would be desirable to enforce the warrant, say, a day or two after the expiration of the twenty-one days, is he entitled to ask the peace officers to put it into force forthwith, or have they, in your opinion, sole discretion to act on any day within the limits?

So many applications are being made under this Act that the matter is one of practical interest, and we should be glad to hear what your readers have to say upon the point, or yourself, if you care to take editorial notice of it.

STRAND.

CASES OF LAST SITTINGS. Court of Appeal.

BLACK v. ADMIRALTY COMMISSIONERS. No. 2. 25th January.

COMPENSATION—DEFENCE OF THE REALM—MUNITIONS—PRODUCTION—INCREASE OR MAINTENANCE—CONTROL OF FACTORIES—INTERFERENCE WITH CLAIMANT'S BUSINESS—NOT DIRECT AND PARTICULAR INTERFERENCE—"DIRECT LOSS"—INDEMNITY ACT, 1920, 10 & 11 Geo. 5, c. 48, s. 2. Schedule, Part II.

Section 2 of the Indemnity Act, 1920, provides for compensation to be awarded for loss suffered by reason of directions by the executive in accordance with the Schedule, Part II, which provides that "the compensation to be awarded shall be assessed by taking into account only the direct loss or damage suffered by the claimant by reason of direct and particular interference with his property or business."

Those words must be construed strictly, and compensation will not be awarded unless the loss incurred is a direct loss or damage suffered by the claimant by reason of direct and particular interference with his property or business.

Where, therefore, the Admiralty, under the Defence of the Realm Regulations, directed trawler builders, with whom the claimant had a contract for the building of trawlers, not to proceed further with any work on the trawlers, but to do Admiralty work,

Held, that there had been no direct and particular interference with the claimant's business and that he was not entitled to compensation under the Act.

Moss Steamship Co. v. Board of Trade, 1923, 1 K.B., 447 C.A.; 1924, A.C. 133; 68 Sol. J. 184, and *Elliott Steam Tug Co. Limited v. The Shipping Controller*, 1922, 1 K.B. 127, considered.

Appeal from the War Compensation Court. The claimant, Sir Alec Black, had entered into a contract with a firm of trawler builders to build for him some trawlers. In October, 1916, before all the trawlers contracted for had been begun, the Admiralty issued an order under Reg. 8A (b) of the Defence of the Realm Regulations directing that the trawler builders should cease work on the trawlers for the claimant, and occupy themselves with Admiralty work required for any articles for use in war. Sir Alec Black claimed compensation, and the matter came before the War Compensation Court, who gave their decision in March, 1923. The War Compensation Court held that the prohibition contained in the Admiralty order of 29th October, 1916, directed to the trawler builders, was a direct interference with the claimant's contractual rights, and that the claimant was entitled to compensation. The Admiralty Commissioners appealed.

BANKES, L.J., in giving judgment referred to *Elliott Steam Tug Co., Ltd. v. The Shipping Controller*, supra, and said that that decision had been very much misunderstood; it was merely a preliminary decision on a particular point and there was no decision of the Court of Appeal on the point whether, on the facts of that case, there was any direct and particular interference; and that the argument founded on *Lumley v. Gye*, 2 E. & B. 214, and similar cases, which had been advanced in the War Compensation Court did not apply; and continued: The question is whether the claimant gave any evidence that he had suffered a loss for which compensation can be given under the Indemnity Act, 1920. His case was that, owing to the order of the Admiralty, the builders, instead of building for him, had built for the Government, and that he had been deprived of these vessels for a considerable time, and as a result he had suffered substantial loss. Although under s. 2 (1) (b) of the Indemnity Act, 1920, the provision in reference to compensation is that a person must show that he has suffered direct loss or damage by reason of interference with his property or business, yet, when under s. 2 (2) (iii) (b) of the same section, the statute lays down the principle on which compensation is to be awarded, it provides that the compensation shall be that indicated in Part II of the Schedule to the Act. Part II of the Schedule provides not only that the loss sustained must be direct loss or damage, but it must be direct loss or damage by reason of direct and particular interference with the property or business. Since the decision of the War Compensation Court (now under appeal), the case of the *Moss Steamship Company*, supra, has been decided by the House of Lords, supra, and it was heard before five law lords. There was a division of opinion, three were in favour of supporting the decision of this court (by which compensation was refused), and two took the opposite view, and the reasons given by the majority for their decision are not the same. Lord Cave and Lord Sumner agreed on the ground on which they dismissed the appeal. Lord Haldane founded his judgment on a different ground, but did not in any way dissent from the ground which was given by Lord Cave and Lord Sumner. In those circumstances, it could be said that the decision in the House of Lords is not strictly binding on this court, but if you find, as you do find, in my opinion, that the judgments of Lord Cave and Lord Sumner are based on grounds which directly apply to the particular case now under appeal, and if those grounds are accepted as correct, as I accept them, they must govern this decision, in my opinion; whether one agrees with them or not, it would be only respectful and one's duty, to follow them. Personally I do agree with them, and I decide this case on the ground that the decisions of Lord Cave and Lord Sumner are right, and should therefore be followed. In the case with which Lord Cave was dealing, the interference with the business of the claimants was an interference by an order to the owners of the vessel which took out of the control of the claimants a vessel which was not only in existence, but which they were actually using, and for which they had provided employment; and, in spite of that, Lord Cave's view was that, if the claimants were to be successful, it must be on the ground that the direction given by the Shipping Controller to the owners to offer the vessel for a voyage to and from the West Indies was a direct and particular interference with the charterer's business. In Lord Cave's opinion it was not such an interference. If the grounds of their decision are sound in reference to the facts of that particular case, they apply, in my opinion, with even greater force to the facts of this case, because the interference here was not an interference with an existing vessel engaged in profitable employment, but it was an interference with the business of the trawler builders in reference to their contract to build vessels which at that moment they had not even commenced to build.

SCRUTTON and SARGANT L.J.J., concurred. Appeal allowed.—COUNSEL: Sir Thomas Inskip, B.G., and G. W. Ricketts, Counsel, K.C., and J. F. Eales. SOLICITORS: Treasury Solicitor; Peacock & Goddard, agents for Grange & Wintringham, Grimsby.

[Reported by T. W. MORGAN, Barrister-at-Law.]

High BEAUMONT

MANOR—COURT OF—COURT TO PROCEED LIMITATIONS

As between entitled to a certain obligation

In re Jennings

Tenants of as are in possession their title.

The lord in which case into the hands

Anonymous

An action the meaning applies to a than six years

This was were as for several man in June 19 and by deed to him in and five from a bookseller manuscripts

In 1902 dealer a lot the Manor of and mainly, use. The Essex newspaper of their price auctioneers no evidence of the waste who was interested defendant in on 2nd June still in his the court request the sale, and returned defendant for alleging wrong pleaded possession person entitled pleaded the

P. O. LAW said: It is of the manor custody of the allowing the Jennings, 19 are entitled possession of their title, in a suit before of the court illegal act if nor his success The obligation possession of liable to the 2 Ves. Sen. 5 1845, 2 Coll were of mere ordinary court they were in or the steward knowing that was advertising buying them to the Statute and cattle of 1623, as M of that section

High Court—Chancery Division.

BEAUMONT v. JEFFERY. P. O. Lawrence, J. 15th May;
8th July.

MANOR—COURT ROLLS—CUSTODY—LIABILITY FOR DISPOSING OF—COURT ROLLS IN POSSESSION OF STRANGER—OBLIGATION TO PRODUCE FOR INSPECTION—DETINUE—STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS, 1623, 21 Jac., c. 16, s. 3.

As between the lord of a manor and the steward, the steward is entitled to the custody of the court rolls of the manor subject to certain obligations as to allowing the lord custody for certain purposes.

In re Jennings, 1902, 1 Ch. 906, followed.

Tenants of a manor are entitled to production of such court rolls as are in possession of the lord or steward for the purpose of evidencing their title.

The lord is not a trustee of the court rolls and can dispose of them, in which case the obligation to produce them follows their possession into the hands of a stranger.

Anonymous, 1754, 2 Ves. Sen. 578, followed.

An action for detinue is not confined to "goods and cattle" within the meaning of s. 3 of the Statute of Limitations, 1623, which only applies to actions for replevin, and an adverse title set up more than six years ago is a good defence.

This was an action for detinue of court rolls. The facts were as follows: The plaintiff who had already acquired several manors and was also the steward of several others, in June 1923, purchased the Manor of Great Tey in Essex, and by deed dated 19th June, 1923, the manor was conveyed to him in fee simple. There were about twelve copyhold and five freehold tenants of the manor. The defendant was a bookseller, who as part of his business purchased all deeds, manuscripts and manorial court rolls of historical interest.

In 1902 the defendant had purchased from a waste paper dealer a lot of odd documents which included the court rolls of the Manor of Great Tey, covering a period from 1399 to 1659, and mainly, if not solely, of historical interest, and of no practical use. The defendant advertised these court rolls for sale in an Essex newspaper about the year 1913. He was not able to dispose of them privately, and in June, 1923, he sent them to some auctioneers in Chancery Lane to be sold by them. There was no evidence to show how the court rolls came into the possession of the waste paper dealer. About July, 1922, the plaintiff, who was interested in court rolls, saw an advertisement of the defendant in an Essex paper, with reference to these rolls, and on 2nd June, 1923, wrote to the defendant asking him if they were still in his possession. The defendant answered that he had sent the court rolls to the auctioneers for sale, and at the plaintiff's request the auctioneers very properly withdrew them from the sale, and returned them, pending the plaintiff's action against the defendant for their recovery. The plaintiff commenced proceedings alleging wrongful detention and damages, and the defendant pleaded possession and willingness to produce the rolls to any person entitled to refer to them for purposes of title, and also pleaded the Statute of Limitations, 21 Jac. 1, c. 16, s. 3.

P. O. LAWRENCE, J., in the course of a considered judgment, said: It is plain upon the authorities that, as between the lord of the manor and the steward, the steward is entitled to the custody of the court rolls, subject to certain obligations as to allowing the lord the custody for special purposes: see *In re Jennings*, 1903, 1 Ch. 906; and further, the tenants of the manor are entitled to production of such court rolls as remain in the possession of the lord or the steward for the purpose of evidencing their title, either in a suit between the tenant and the lord, or in a suit between tenants *inter se*. But the lord is not a trustee of the court rolls in the sense that he would be committing an illegal act if he were to dispose of them. In that case neither he nor his successor would have a right of action to recover them. The obligation, however to produce the rolls would follow the possession of them into the hands of a stranger and render him liable to the obligation to produce them: see *Anonymous*, 1754, 2 Ves. Sen. 578, and *The Dean and Chapter of Wells v. Doddington*, 1845, 2 Coll. 73. The court will presume that the rolls, which were of mere historical interest, were acquired by Poole in the ordinary course of his business, and that when he acquired them they were in the custody of the rightful owner, that is, the lord or the steward, or both. The plaintiff who acquired the manor, knowing that the rolls were in the possession of a bookseller who was advertising them for sale, cannot recover them without buying them from the person who is offering them for sale. As to the Statute of Limitations, even if the rolls were not "goods and cattle" within the meaning of s. 3 of the Statute of James of 1623, as Mr. Jenkins has suggested, upon the true construction of that section an action of detinue is not confined to "goods

and cattle," which are mentioned only in reference to actions of replevin, and as the plaintiff's action is one of detinue for the rolls, and the cause of action, namely, the setting up by the defendant of an adverse title when he advertised their sale, arose more than six years before the commencement of the action, the action fails and will be dismissed with costs.—COUNSEL: *Jenkins, K.C., and Dighton Pollock; F. H. L. Errington. SOLICITORS: Beaumont, Son & Rigden; J. Tickle & Co.*

[Reported by L. M. MAY, Barrister-at-Law.]

High Court—King's Bench Division.

COMMISSIONERS OF INLAND REVENUE v. FISHER.

Rowlatt, J. 27th June.

REVENUE—SURPLUS PROFITS OF COMPANY—ISSUED TO SHAREHOLDERS IN FORM OF DEBENTURE STOCK—INCOME—SUPERTAX.

A company, having at its disposal a large sum of money, consisting of surplus profits, issued that sum pro rata among the ordinary shareholders in the form of debentures. A shareholder was assessed to super-tax on the footing that his holding in the debentures so issued was assessable as income.

Held, that the shareholder was assessable to super-tax in respect of the debentures, as the issue of the debentures, in effect, amounted to a distribution by the company of a share of undivided profits.

Commissioners of Inland Revenue v. Blott, 65 Sol. J. 642; 1921, 2 A.C. 171, referred to.

Case stated by Commissioners for the Special Purposes of the Income Tax Acts. A shareholder in the Wearmouth Coal Co., Ltd., was assessed to super-tax in the sum of £8,250 for the year ending 5th April, 1916, under the provisions of the Income Tax Acts in respect of a bonus received from the company in the year 1914-1915. On the 25th March, 1914, the directors of the company, being of opinion that a large sum consisting of undistributed profits should be capitalised, proposed to distribute the sum in question, which amounted to £357,500, *pro rata* among the ordinary shareholders in the form of 5 per cent. debenture stock. The necessary meetings were held and the debenture stock was issued and became repayable in certain events. The shareholder in question (who was since deceased) held 14,400 ordinary shares of £5 each, of which 12,000 were fully paid, and 2,400 on which £2 10s. only was paid; and also 7,640 preference shares of £5 each, all fully paid. By virtue of his holding of ordinary shares he became entitled as his share of the bonus to £82,500 of debenture stock of which, in accordance with the agreement of 28th April, 1914, £16,540 had to be parted with in exchange for a corresponding amount of fully-paid preference shares, with the result that £65,960 debenture stock was retained. He did not receive, nor was he entitled to receive, any payment in cash for his share of the bonus, and the net result was that he retained his 14,400 ordinary shares, obtained 3,308 preference shares from preference shareholders, and so held 10,948 preference shares instead of 7,640, and also received £65,960 in the debenture stock of the company. It was contended for the respondents that the debenture stock was distributed to persons who were entitled to the assets of the company; that the bonus was declared in such terms as ensured that the profits should remain in the hands of the company; that none of the assets of the company were parted with by the distribution; and that the case was covered by *Commissioners of Inland Revenue v. Blott, supra*. On behalf of the Crown it was contended that there was a liberation of assets and a distribution of profits by the company to the ordinary shareholders, and the amount received by them was income in their hands; that there was a distinction between a debenture stockholder and a shareholder, in that the former was a creditor of the company; and that the bonus distribution was income to the recipient and was liable to assessment to super-tax. The Commissioners held that the bonus paid in debenture stock was not income in the hands of the recipient and was not, therefore, liable to super-tax. The Crown appealed.

ROWLATT, J., delivering judgment, said that the case was distinguishable from the case of *Commissioners of Inland Revenue v. Blott, supra*, which was a case in which the share capital of a company was increased. In the present case the sum in question was only capitalised in the sense that it was impounded for the use of the company. In the present case the effect of the transaction was the creation of a security and the issue to the shareholders at once of a portion of the undivided profits. It would be necessary for the debenture stock to be valued. The case must be sent back to the Commissioners to determine the amount to be paid. The appeal must therefore be allowed. COUNSEL: *Sir Patrick Hastings, A.-G., and R. P. Hills; Latter, K.C., and Cyril King. SOLICITORS: Solicitor of Inland Revenue; Raule, Johnstone & Co., for Cooper & Jackson, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.*

[Reported by J. L. DENISON, Barrister-at-Law.]

The Discipline Committee.

At a meeting of the Committee of The Law Society, constituted under the Solicitors Acts, 1888-1919, held in their hall in Chancery-lane on 30th July, Sir Roger Gregory presiding, the following solicitors were declared guilty of professional misconduct and were ordered to be struck off the roll:—

JOHN LEE DAVIES, formerly of Warrington, Lancashire, who was convicted at the Central Criminal Court of stealing a cheque book and was sentenced to six months' imprisonment in the second division.

HERBERT ROGER SADD, formerly of Lawrence-lane, E.C.2, 33, Lancaster-road, Hampstead, N.W., Hastings and Shepperton, who was convicted at the Central Criminal Court of fraudulent conversion and was sentenced to three years' penal servitude.

JOHN ABERCROMBIE HOLDSWORTH, formerly of Serjeants' Inn, Fleet-street, E.C., who was convicted at the Central Criminal Court of fraudulent conversion and was sentenced to three years' penal servitude.

CHARLES EDWARD BEST, formerly of Budge-row, Cannon-street, E.C., who was convicted at the Central Criminal Court of fraudulent conversion and was sentenced to be imprisoned for twenty-one months in the second division.

In Parliament.

New Statutes.

On 1st August the Royal Assent was given to:—

Finance Act, 1924.

Carriage of Goods by Sea Act, 1924.

British Museum Act, 1924.

Isle of Man (Customs) Act, 1924.

Telegraph (Money) Act, 1924.

Public Works Loans Act, 1924.

Conveyancing (Scotland) Act, 1924.

Government of India (Leave of Absence) Act, 1924.

Local Authorities (Emergency Provisions) Act, 1924.

Unemployment Insurance (No. 2) Act, 1924.

And to a number of Provisional Orders, Public Utility and Local Acts.

House of Lords.

30th July. Nationality of Married Women. Motion by Lord Danesfort:—

"That in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that His Majesty's Government shall, after consultation with the Dominions, introduce legislation at an early date to give effect to the unanimous opinion of the Joint Select Committee on the Nationality of Married Women—that a British-born woman shall not on marriage lose her British nationality if she does not acquire that of her husband under the law of his country—without prejudice to the larger questions which have been raised as to the position of British and alien women respectively in regard to the retention and acquisition of British nationality on their marriage."

The Lord President of the Council, Lord Parmoor, stated that the Government were in sympathy with the motion, but that, in view of the necessity of consulting with the Dominions, legislation could not be introduced at the present moment. Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Public Health (Scotland) Amendment Bill. On motion of Lord Muir-Mackenzie, Bill read a Second time and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

National Health Insurance Bill. Further amendments made. Bill passed and sent to the Commons.

Circuit Courts and Criminal Procedure (Scotland) Bill. Considered in Committee, and reported without amendment.

London Traffic Bill. On motion for Third reading, amendments made. Bill passed and returned to the Commons.

Finance Bill. Read a Third time and passed.

31st July. Law of Property Amendment Bill.

Law of Property (Consolidation) Bill.

Land Charges (Consolidation) Bill.

Trustee (Consolidation) Bill.

Land Registration (Consolidation) Bill.

Settled Land (Consolidation) Bill.

Administration of Estates (Consolidation) Bill.

The Lord Chancellor (Viscount Haldane) in introducing these Bills, said: "These are Bills with which I have no intention of proceeding at the present time, but I am desirous of having them printed so that we may have the benefit of any criticisms which may be made between now and the time when the House re-assembles in the autumn. These Bills relate to the law of property, and perhaps your Lordships would permit me, although

it is unusual, to occupy two or three minutes at the outside in making a statement of what they consist. Your Lordships remember that my noble and learned Friend, Lord Birkenhead, passed a great Act called the Law of Property Act, and that Act, as was almost inevitable with so great an Act, was not the work of any single Lord Chancellor. I myself, in 1913 and 1914, had introduced what was substantially the same Bill, but it was much improved before my noble and learned Friend took it up. At his request I presided over a Joint Committee of the two Houses for the purpose of putting the Act into shape. In the end my noble and learned Friend, with something that seemed to me to amount to genius, did what I should have doubted my own capacity to succeed in doing—he passed the Bill through Parliament, and so the Act passed on to the Statute Book. When my noble and learned Friend, Lord Cave, succeeded to the office of Lord Chancellor, he took a view, in which I concurred and in which Lord Birkenhead concurred, that we should not really put the law of real property into shape, unless we passed further Acts amending the other statutory provisions belonging to our history and which deal with the law of real property. All the Bills necessary have now been prepared. There is an Amending Bill, which deals with Statutes going back to the thirteenth century. They are all brought into shape, and if that Bill, which is one of those that I propose now to introduce, and which I have inherited really in a large measure from Lord Cave, passes, then all that will be required will be to pass six Consolidation Bills, for which no time will be required, because they do not change what will then be the law at all. I should tell your lordships what the Bills I propose to introduce are. As I have said, I do not propose to proceed further with them at present. They are seven in number and they carry out the policy concurred in by Lord Cave as well as Lord Birkenhead himself, and embody work done also by others. The first is a Bill to amend the Law of Property Act, and the enactments thereby affected. I passed through this House the other day a Bill suspending for a year the operation of Lord Birkenhead's Act in order to enable these amendments to be made. Then there are six other Bills. There is one to consolidate all the enactments relating to conveyancing and the law of real property in England and Wales; one to consolidate the enactments relating to settled land; one to consolidate the enactments relating to trustees; there is one to consolidate the enactments relating to the registration of land charges; one to consolidate the Land Transfer Acts; and, the last, one to consolidate the law relating to administration of estates. If the Amending Bill passes, and if these Consolidating Bills are also passed, then your lordships will have what successive Chancellors have suggested as the ideal at which they ought to aim, that the whole law relating to property should be consolidated into six convenient volumes, which I trust your lordships will all have in your libraries, if not bound in morocco, at any rate bound in buckram. They will be a fertile source from which to inquire into the state of the law as regards property, and will enormously facilitate the work of those engaged in this practice.

India. Debate on Motion by Viscount Peel, made on 21st July, "That an Humble Address be presented to His Majesty for papers relating to the situation in India," continued and Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Unemployment Insurance (No. 2) Bill. Consideration of the Commons' Reasons for disagreeing with certain of the Lords' Amendments, and certain Amendments not insisted on.

Old Age Pensions Bill. Read a Second time: Committee negatived.

Pensions (Increase) Bill. Read a Second time and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

Conveyancing (Scotland) Amendment Bill. Read a Third time, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Summary Jurisdiction (Separation and Maintenance) Bill. Considered in Committee, Bill reported without amendment.

Circuit Courts and Criminal Procedure (Scotland) Bill. Read a Third time, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

1st August. Public Health (Smoke Abatement) Bill. Considered in Committee, and amendments made.

Local Authorities (Emergency Provisions) Bill. Consideration of Commons' Reasons for disagreeing with the Lords' Amendment. Amendment not insisted on.

Agricultural Wages Bill. Read a Second time and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

Pensions (Increase) Bill. Considered in Committee. Bill reported without amendment.

4th August. Housing (Financial Provisions) Bill. Considered in Committee. Motion by the Earl of Middleton:—

"That this House, before going into Committee, resolves that, having regard (1) to the great charge on public and municipal funds involved in the Bill; (2) to the deficiency of skilled labour and increasing cost of materials; (3) to the consequent delay and enhanced cost in erecting the necessary houses, an immediate inquiry should be set on foot by His

Majesty of other rapidly Motion Old Age and Main Third time 5th Au of amend Third tim London ment to agreeing t ment for Amendm instead, o Agricult Marquis Powers o minimum new sub- " (5) section which i day's v Rejecte Seditio a Third ti

Sir K. whether complete possible, that such between action in The A Chief Jus considera their repo

Mr. R. Home Sec conduct c to the ap the office that inqu with a view and hard Mr. DA a Draft coroners' Member

Viscon Secretary in the V promised of the pri substanti office are principal be make Mr. GR the ques Revenue would be The re-o deferred managem present p which my in introd

Lieut.- Secretary recommen

Majesty's Government as to the possibility of building houses of other materials than brick, which could be erected more rapidly and at less cost."

Motion agreed to. Amendments made.

Old Age Pensions Bill, Summary Jurisdiction (Separation and Maintenance) Bill, and Pensions (Increase) Bill. Read a Third time and passed.

5th August. Housing (Financial Provisions) Bill. Report of amendments. Further amendments made, and Bill read a Third time and returned to the Commons.

London Traffic Bill. Consideration of the Commons' Amendment to a Lords' Amendment and Commons' Reasons for disagreeing to certain of the Lords' Amendments. Lords' Amendment for including tramcars not insisted on, by 56 to 6. Lords' Amendment for extending the operation of the Bill till 1930, instead, of 1927, insisted on (since agreed at 1928).

Agricultural Wages Bill. Considered in Committee. The Marquis of Lincoln moved to insert in Clause 2 (Duties and Powers of Agricultural Wages Committees with respect to minimum rates for wages), after s-s. (4), to insert the following new sub-section:—

"(5) In fixing minimum rates for time-work under this section a committee shall secure, for able-bodied men, wages which in their opinion are equivalent to wages for an ordinary day's work at the rate of at least thirty shillings per week."

Rejected by 53 to 17. Amendments made.

Seditious and Blasphemous Teaching to Children Bill. Read a Third time, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

House of Commons.

Questions.

CROWN PROCEEDINGS.

Sir K. WOOD (Woolwich, West) asked the Attorney-General whether his attention has been called to the desirability of a complete revision of Crown proceedings so as to secure as far as possible, and with due regard to the secrecy of State documents, that such proceedings shall be assimilated to proceedings as between subject and subject; and whether he is taking any action in the matter?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: A Committee of which the Lord Chief Justice is chairman, has for some time been engaged in the consideration of this difficult and important subject. I hope that their report may be available at no very distant date.

CORONERS AND CORONERS' INQUESTS.

Mr. R. RICHARDSON (Durham, Houghton-le-Spring) asked the Home Secretary if he will initiate legislation to secure the better conduct of post-mortem examinations, to prevent the nomination to the appointment of coroner by private individuals, to bring the office more into accord with modern needs, and to arrange that inquests should be adjourned until after trials at assizes, with a view to avoiding unnecessary expense and the inconvenience and hardship to witnesses giving evidence before these tribunals?

Mr. DAVIES: My right hon. Friend has now under consideration a Draft Bill for amending the law relating to coroners and coroners' inquests. It deals with the points to which the hon. Member refers.

INLAND REVENUE DEPARTMENT (VALUATION OFFICE).

Viscount CURZON (Battersea, South) asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that the officials in the Valuation Office of the Board of Inland Revenue were promised a re-grading scheme over four years ago, when the whole of the principal officers of the Inland Revenue were re-graded with substantial increments, and that over 100 ex-service men in that office are still awaiting corresponding benefits to those which the principal officials have been enjoying for over four years; and can he make any statement?

Mr. GRAHAM: I presume that the reference in the first part of the question is to an announcement by the Board of Inland Revenue that the re-organisation of certain grades of the staff would be taken in hand as soon as circumstances might permit. The re-organisation of the Valuation Office has necessarily been deferred pending a decision on the general question of the management of Government valuation services. As regards the present position, I would remind the Noble Lord of the statement which my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer made in introducing his Budget proposals.

FIRES (INQUIRIES).

Lieut.-Colonel FREMANTLE (St. Albans) asked the Home Secretary whether he proposes to carry out the unanimous recommendation of the Royal Commission on Fire Brigades and

Fire Prevention that judicial inquiries should, in proper cases, be made concerning non-fatal as well as fatal fires; and, if so, whether such inquiries will be made by coroners, as recommended by the Departmental Committee of the Home Office in their Report of 1910, or by local panels of experts nominated by the Home Secretary, as recommended by the Royal Commission?

Mr. DAVIES: My right hon. Friend hopes that it may be possible to make provision, of general application, for the holding of fire inquiries, but he is not yet in a position to state what course the Government will propose to adopt. (31st July.)

PREVENTION OF EVICTIONS ACT.

Mr. PALMER (Greenwich) asked the Attorney-General whether, having regard to the fact that most County Court Judges during the long vacation will not be available in August and September, any steps can be taken to establish vacation Courts in order to consider applications under Section 2 (1) of the Prevention of Evictions Act, 1924, in order to protect poor tenants?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The County Courts have no long vacation. A Judge is bound to hold each of the Courts on his circuit at least once in every month, with the exception of one month, which is usually either August or September, but cannot be both. This enables the Judge to have a necessary holiday, but the existing machinery is sufficient to protect the rights of tenants while the Judge is not sitting. Any Judge is capable of acting for any other Judge in any place, and enough Judges will be available in August and September to deal with urgent applications with which the Registrar cannot deal. It is, therefore, not necessary to adopt my hon. Friend's suggestion. I may add that Registrars have certain powers of suspending Orders and staying execution during the Judge's absence, and my right hon. Friend the Lord Chancellor is considering whether these powers are sufficient, or whether they ought to be extended. (4th August.)

Bills Introduced.

Suicide Bill—"to amend the Law relating to suicide": Brigadier-General Spears, on leave given. [Bill 230.]

Port of London Authority Bill—"to amend the constitution of the Port of London Authority": Mr. Scurr, on leave given. [Bill 231.] (30th July.)

Catholic Relief Bill—"to provide for the further relief of His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects": Mr. Blundell. [Bill 247.]

Demolition of Dwelling-houses (Prohibition) Bill—"to prohibit the demolition of dwelling-houses, and for other purposes connected therewith": Mr. Herbert Morrison, on leave given. [Bill 248.]

Companies Law Amendment Bill—"to give powers to the President of the Board of Trade to refuse the use of the word British by limited liability companies and to impose limitations upon its use": Mr. Remer, on leave given. [Bill 249.]

(5th August.)

Bill Refused.

"Bill to provide for the prevention of vexatious candidatures for local government authorities": Mr. Cooper Rawson. Leave refused by 163 to 130. (5th August.)

Bills under Consideration.

30th July. Unemployment Insurance (No. 2) Bill. Lords Amendments considered, certain of them disagreed with, and a Committee appointed to draw up reasons for disagreement. Reasons reported later and agreed to, and to be communicated to the Lords.

1st August. London Traffic Bill. Lords Amendments considered. Certain of them, including the extension of the restrictions on omnibuses to tramcars, disagreed with, and further proceedings as above under Unemployment Insurance (No. 2) Bill.

National Health Insurance Bill (Lords). Read a Second time and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

Motor Car Races Bill. Second Reading moved by Lt.-Col. Moore-Brabazon. Objected to in the interest of the freedom of the highway by Mr. Rawlinson. Debate adjourned.

4th August. National Health Insurance Bill (Lords) Considered in Committee, and reported without amendment. Bill read the Third time and passed, without amendment.

Arbitration Clauses (Protocol) Bill (Lords). Not amended in the Standing Committee, read the Third time and passed, without amendment.

Workmen's Compensation (Silicosis) Bill (Lords). Read a Second time and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

New Orders, &c.

Board of Trade.

ASSURANCE COMPANIES ACT COMMITTEE.

A Committee has been appointed by the President of the Board of Trade to inquire into the working of the Assurance Companies Act. The Committee is constituted as follows:—

Mr. A. C. Clauson, K.C. (Chairman).
Mr. S. J. H. W. Allin.
Sir Gilbert Garnsey.
Mr. C. M. Knowles, LL.B.
Mr. J. C. McBride.
Mr. O. Morgan Owen.
Mr. W. P. Phelps, F.I.A.
Mr. G. Stuart Robertson, K.C.
Mr. A. L. Sturge.
Mr. H. M. Trouncer, F.I.A.
Mr. H. M. Winearls.

The Secretary to the Committee, to whom all communications should be addressed, is Mr. W. J. Smith, Board of Trade, Great George Street, London, S.W.1. In order to give opportunity to the members of the Committee to survey the ground which will be covered by the inquiry, the first sitting of the Committee will not take place before the middle of October.

Societies.

The Law Society.

ADJOURNED ANNUAL MEETING.

VACANCIES ON COUNCIL.

The adjourned annual general meeting of The Law Society was held on Thursday, the 7th inst., at The Law Society's Hall, Chancery-lane, the Vice-President, Mr. W. W. Gibson, B.A., LL.M. (Newcastle-on-Tyne), taking the chair. The following members of the Council were among those present: The Right Hon. Sir William James Bull, Bart., M.P., Mr. Weeden Dawes, The Hon. Robert Henry Lyttelton, M.A., Mr. Charles Gibbons May, Mr. George William Rowe, Mr. Samuel Saw, and Mr. E. R. Cook (Secretary).

The meeting had been adjourned for the purpose of receiving the report of the scrutineers upon the ballot to fill the twelve vacancies on the Council caused by the retirement of ten members in rotation and the resignation of Sir Homewood Crawford and the death of Sir Walter Trower. There were thirteen candidates.

Mr. J. R. Yates (chairman of scrutineers) read the report as follows:—

Council Election, 1924.—Report of the scrutineers to be presented at the adjourned general meeting of the Society on 7th August, 1924.

We, the undersigned, being four of the five scrutineers duly appointed at the annual general meeting of the Society, held on the 25th day of July, 1924, to receive and examine the voting papers and to certify the result of the election of candidates for the Council, report as follows:—

The Secretary handed to us on Tuesday, 5th August, 1924, the boxes containing the voting papers, which he informed us had been placed in them as they were delivered. The voting papers were opened and examined by us.

The first schedule hereto annexed contains a statement of the total number of voting papers received, and the number rejected, and the grounds of such rejection.

The second schedule contains a statement of the total number of votes given in favour of each candidate.

The third schedule contains the names of those candidates whom we find and certify to be duly elected.

The voting papers have been replaced by us in the boxes, closed up under our seal, and handed to the Secretary.

THE FIRST SCHEDULE

Referred to in the Annexed Report.

Voting Papers received, rejected, etc.

The total number of voting papers received was 3,043, of which 41 were rejected on the following grounds:—

(a) Received after the proper date	23
(b) Unsigned	12
(c) No name struck out	5
(d) Spoilt	1
	41

THE SECOND SCHEDULE Referred to in the Annexed Report.

Votes in favour of each candidate.

	Total votes.
The Right Hon. Sir William James Bull, Bart., P.C., M.P.	2,619
George Herbert Charlesworth	2,632
Cecil Allen Coward	2,581
Charles Augustus Davis	1,089
Weeden Dawes	2,533
Robert William Dibdin	2,085
Hubert Arthur Dowson	2,840
Walter Henry Foster	2,627
The Hon. Robert Henry Lyttelton	2,623
William Egerton Mortimer	2,488
George William Rowe	2,495
Benjamin Arthur Wightman	2,838
Walter Mantell Woodhouse	2,428

THE THIRD SCHEDULE

Referred to in the Annexed Report.

Names of Candidates duly Elected.

	Total votes.
Hubert Arthur Dowson	2,840
Benjamin Arthur Wightman	2,838
George Herbert Charlesworth	2,832
Robert William Dibdin	2,085
Walter Henry Foster	2,627
The Hon. Robert Henry Lyttelton	2,623
The Rt. Hon. Sir William James Bull, P.C., M.P. ..	2,619
Cecil Allen Coward	2,581
Weeden Dawes	2,533
George William Rowe	2,495
William Egerton Mortimer	2,488
Walter Mantell Woodhouse	2,428

(Signed) J. R. YATES, Chairman.

" W. MONTGOMERY WHITE.

" E. B. V. CHRISTIAN.

" W. HASELDINE JONES.

Law Society's Hall,

Chancery Lane, W.C.2,

5th August, 1924.

On the motion of the Vice-President, a note of thanks was passed to the scrutineers, and Mr. Yates briefly responded.

It will be seen that the retiring members have all been re-elected with the addition of Mr. W. E. Mortimer and Mr. W. M. Woodhouse.

THE NEW PRESIDENT.

In our note last week (*ante*, p. 857) on Mr. William Henry Norton, the new President of The Law Society, we gave his firm as Messrs. Norton, Spencer, Lovatt & Smith. This should have been Messrs. Norton, Spencer, Youatt & Smith.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COUNCIL.

The following are extracts from the Report for 1923-4:—

Council Vacancies.—There are twelve vacancies on the Council, ten of which are caused by retirement in rotation. The members who retire by rotation are—Sir William Bull, Mr. Charlesworth, Mr. Coward, Mr. Dawes, Mr. Dibdin, Mr. Dowson, Mr. Foster, Mr. Lyttelton, Mr. Rowe, Mr. Wightman. They are eligible for re-election. The additional vacancies are caused by the death of Sir Walter Trower and the retirement of Sir Homewood Crawford.

Since the last Annual Report was issued the Council have sustained a serious loss through the death of Mr. Charles Leopold Samson, which took place on the 8th June, 1923. Mr. Samson was elected a member of the Council in 1902, and President of the Society in 1912. He had interested himself closely in the work of the Council, and had earned the gratitude of his professional brethren by his long service on their behalf.

On the 16th March, 1924, another severe loss was sustained in the death of Mr. Charles Scriven of Leeds. He had been a member of the Council for the comparatively short period of three years, but during that time had applied himself assiduously to his duties as to render himself competent to take a full share in the work. He had interested himself particularly in the subject of Legal Education in the Provinces, and his work on the Legal Education Committee and on the Yorkshire Board of Legal Studies will long be remembered with gratitude. Mr. Scriven represented the grouped Societies in the Yorkshire District as an extraordinary member of the Council, and those grouped Societies have since nominated Mr. Reginald Armstrong of Leeds to take Mr. Scriven's place, and he has accordingly been elected for the remainder of Mr. Scriven's term of office.

Sir Walter Trower died on the 5th April, 1924. His name was so well known in the profession, and the extent of his activities so widely appreciated, that members will have realised already what a serious gap his death has created. He had directed his attention mainly to Finance, Education, Discipline, and Land Transfer, and with regard to all these matters he took a leading part in the deliberations of the Council. He was Chairman of the Finance Committee from 1902 to 1921, and piloted the Society through the difficulties caused by the war. With regard to Legal Education, his name will always be associated with the Council's efforts to establish an Imperial School of Law. As to Discipline he had attained to the position of Senior Chairman of the Committee, and his colleagues bear testimony to the ability and patient consideration which he devoted to every case which came before him. Sir Walter Trower also had for many years applied himself closely to the study of Land Transfer. Lord Haldane consulted him with regard to the Bills which he introduced in 1913, and he was appointed a member of the Committee which sat under the chairmanship of Sir Leslie Scott to enquire into the methods for acquiring land. When Lord Birkenhead introduced his Law of Property Bill the Council pressed that the non-registration system should be given a fair trial as against registration and the officialism and publicity which it involves. Sir Walter Trower took a leading part in the negotiations which were opened, and their successful termination was due largely to his efforts. These are but a few of the matters as to which the profession were under an obligation to Sir Walter Trower. They owe him a deep debt of gratitude for his many years of service.

Mr. W. A. Weightman, Liverpool, to the regret of his colleagues, retired from the Council as an extraordinary member on the 30th November, 1923. He represented the Incorporated Law Society of Liverpool, on whose nomination Mr. Finlay Dun of Liverpool has since been appointed to take Mr. Weightman's place.

Sir Homewood Crawford became a member of the Council in 1909, and has performed much useful work, particularly on the Legal Education Committee. Owing to ill-health Sir Homewood has for some months been unable to attend the meetings of the Council, and it is with much regret that the Council have felt compelled to accept his resignation.

The late Mr. E. W. Williamson.—Mr. E. W. Williamson died on the 6th December, 1923, at the advanced age of 92 years. He was appointed Secretary of the Society in 1863 and retired from that position in 1909. During this period the Society attained a position, both as regards membership and responsibility, it had never reached before. An obituary notice setting out Mr. Williamson's services in fuller detail appeared in the Society's Gazette.

Principal and Director of Legal Studies.—Members of the Society will have observed with much regret from the notices on the subject which have appeared in the Press that the Society is about to lose the services of its Principal and Director of Legal Studies, Dr. Edward Jenks. He was appointed to the position in the year 1903, and has conducted the educational work of the Society with great ability. His wide learning has been placed unreservedly at the disposal of those who have been privileged to attend the Society's School, and his organising ability has assisted the Council not merely in London, but with regard to the educational requirements of the provinces. They have received special assistance from him in connection with the organisation of Provincial Law Schools, the establishment of which has followed upon the passing of the Solicitors Act, 1923, and they desire not merely to acknowledge that assistance but also to express their gratitude for it. Dr. Jenks has been appointed to the responsible position of Professor of English Law at the University of London, and the Council wish him every success in his new sphere of work.

Membership of the Society.—The Society has now 9,557 members, of whom 4,045 practise in town and 5,512 in the country. The number of members who joined the Society during the past year is 423 as compared with 314 in the previous year. After allowing for deaths, resignations, and exclusions, the number of members shows an increase for the year of 141.

American Bar Association.—Early in 1923 the Council were informed that the English Bar desired to invite the American Bar Association to visit London, and that as the American Bar Association represented the entire profession in America, it had been thought that The Law Society might wish to join in the invitation. The suggestion was readily accepted by the Council. The invitation to the American Bar Association accordingly was sent by the then Attorney-General and Solicitor-General, the Chairman of the General Council of the Bar, and the President of the Law Society. It was accepted in a letter of the 13th September from the President of the American Bar Association, in which, after stating that the acceptance of the invitation had been adopted with acclamation, he expressed the certainty that the gathering would prove inspiring and stimulating, and would strengthen the fraternal feeling prevailing throughout the profession in both countries. A Committee acting with the Law

Officers has been formed to make the necessary arrangements, and consists of one representative from each of the four Inns of Court, and from the Bar Council and The Law Society.

Centenary of the Society.—The Law Society was founded at a General Meeting held at Furnival's Inn Hall on 2nd June, 1825. There had been issued in the year 1823 a Prospectus advocating the formation of the Society, and this had been followed on the 29th March, 1825, by a meeting at Searle's Coffee House, of solicitors who had joined in the formation of the Society. At this meeting a Committee was appointed to draw up a scheme for submission to a General Meeting of the subscribers, and it was to such a meeting, held as already stated on the 2nd June, 1825, that a Report of the result of the Committee's deliberations was presented. The resolutions which were moved and carried unanimously at that meeting were the foundation of the Society. The Council have appointed a Special Committee to consider the desirability of signaling in some special manner the hundredth anniversary of the occasion.

Belgian Society of Advocates.—The Council were invited to send a representative to the Annual Meeting of the Belgian Bar at Tournai on the 30th June, 1923. Mr. Charles Mackintosh, LL.D., attended, and he and Mrs. Mackintosh were received with great courtesy and hospitality. A letter of thanks for their kindness was subsequently sent by the Council to the Belgian Society.

Registry Department.—The number of entries on the various Registers shows a small increase, and the average number of replies forwarded in answer to entries per month was considerably larger than last year. The Registry still suffers from a lack of patronage, notwithstanding that the fee of 4s. for an entry of 60 words in a paper with a circulation of over 9,500 copies a month is very low. The Council recommend members to take full advantage of the Registers when they have sales and mortgages to arrange which they cannot conclude in their own offices, and believe they will benefit thereby.

Some complaints have been received from members who had made entries on the "clerkships vacant" register (G) that few replies have been received. It is thought that this is accounted for by the fact that a statement of the salaries offered has been omitted. The Council advise members to supply this information when making entries. The average number of replies to entries of vacancies forwarded through the Register is six per entry.

The attention of members is directed to the fact that no clerk is allowed to inspect the Register of Vacant Situations or enter his name without first having produced a letter of recommendation from a member of the Society, or, in cases where it is impossible to obtain this, from some responsible person, to the effect that the clerk is personally known to the writer and is of good character. By this means the Council are able to ensure that the Register is, so far as possible, kept free of undesirable applicants. Members are requested not to sign the form of recommendation unless the clerk asking them to do so is one whom they would employ in their own office if they had a vacancy which he could fill.

In the event of any member being compelled to dismiss a clerk for dishonesty or any flagrant irregularity (whether such clerk has been engaged through the Registry or not), the Council will be glad to have particulars of the case and a specimen of the clerk's handwriting.

Record and Statistical Department.—The attention of members is particularly called to this Department, which is of very great assistance to those who are desirous of ascertaining the successors of retired or deceased solicitors, or the whereabouts of their business papers. It has also collected much other useful and interesting information, which is available to members without charge. As it is in the interest of all that the records should be as complete as possible, the Secretary particularly wishes the co-operation of all members, and they are requested to communicate to him any information which they may from time to time receive as to the death of solicitors, their successors, or the disposal of their papers. It would also be of great assistance if he were informed of the whereabouts of solicitors who are not taking out practising certificates, and of any appointments, changes in the name of firms, dissolution of partnership, etc. During the year ending 15th November, 1923, 5,093 London and 9,933 country practising certificates were issued, as compared with 5,055 and 9,834 respectively in the previous year. During the year under review 291 certificates of deaths of solicitors have been received from Registrars of Deaths, as compared with 247 received in the previous year.

Examination.—The numbers of successful candidates in 1923-24 as compared with the numbers in 1922-23 are as follows:—Preliminary, 160, as against 169; Intermediate (Law) 383, as against 339; Accounts and Book-keeping 479, as against 544; Final 454, as against 444; Honours 51, as against 62. A comparison between the number of Articles of Clerkship registered in 1913 and 1923 shows that in the former year there were registered 482 Articles of Clerkship, of which 428 were original Articles, while in 1923, 681 Articles were registered, of which 636 were original Articles, showing an increase in the number

entering into Articles of Clerkship of 208. The number of persons admitted as solicitors in 1913 was 485, and in 1923 it was 444, a decrease of 41.

Colonial Examinations.—Since the issue of the Annual Report for the year 1923 two Final and two Intermediate Examinations have been held, under the auspices of the Society, in the Colony of Jamaica, two Final and two Intermediate Examinations in the Colony of Trinidad, and one Final Examination in the Colony of British Guiana.

(To be continued.)

The Grotius Society.

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING.

The Annual General Meeting of the Grotius Society took place on the 29th ult., at No. 2 King's Bench Walk, Temple, the President, Mr. Herbert Manisty, K.C., in the chair. Among those present were Lord Dunedin, Mr. H. S. Henriques, K.C., Master Jelf, Mr. Y. Fredericksen (Legal Adviser to the Norwegian Government), Dr. W. R. Bisschop, Mr. J. G. Phillimore, B.C.L., Mr. Wyndham A. Bewes, LL.D., Mr. William Latey, Mr. Claude Mullins, Mr. Arthur Jaffé, Dr. Colombos, Sir Graham Bower, Professor J. E. G. de Montmorency, M.A., LL.D., and Dr. Hugh Bellot (hon. secretary).

FRENCH CONCEPTION OF DOMICIL.

Maitre THÉRÈSE LION, Avocat à la Cour de Paris, read a paper upon "The French Conception of Domicil." She observed that the present doctrine of domicile in France was that of nationality as regarded French subjects abroad. In this the system was opposed to the Anglo-Saxon system, which made the personal status depend on domicile. But this did not mean that domicile played no part at all in French private international law. It was an important element of status, and it was often necessary in practice to ascertain the domicile of persons. In one case the law of domicile might take the place of national law. Persons with no nationality, or with doubtful nationality, were governed by the law of their domicile; and in case of double nationality the law of domicile necessarily prevailed. As regarded corporations, their nationality depended on the place of their head office, that is, of their domicile. More frequently, nationality was influenced by domicile, and it was very much so in the case of a child born in France of foreign parents, both of whom were born in a foreign country; for if he should be still domiciled in France when becoming of age, he would be regarded as a French subject, unless he repudiated the French nationality in the year of his coming of age. Theoretically, foreigners were not entitled to have a French domicile, but the courts admitted that a permanent residence, a *domicil de facto*, was equivalent to a *domicil de jure*. If he did not become domiciled in France at his majority he would remain a foreigner, but he might choose the French nationality, and so effectively establish his domicile in France. Another strong effect of domicile on nationality was governed by the fact that a prolonged stay in France was a condition of naturalisation. Moreover domicile might be, as it were, a principle of nationalisation, whenever the application of the law depended on the implicit will of the parties. For example, two persons were married without making a marriage settlement and were domiciled in another country than the husband's country. In this case the courts had adopted the conception that the rule to be applied should be that of the matrimonial domicile, that was, of the first establishment of the parties. Where a settlement was made, it might happen that the parties had not expressed their intention to apply such or such legislation; they were regarded by most writers to come under the law of the place where the contract was to produce its effects; that is, the law of the matrimonial domicile, the future seat of the conjugal association. The function of domicile, became more and more important in connection with the legal relations depending on the free will of the parties. But the most far-reaching consequences of the application of the principle of domicile in French law were those in connection with jurisdiction. A foreigner could not serve a writ on another foreigner, even regarding contracts made in France, but this principle was no longer applied where one of the parties had established his domicile there under art. 13 of the Civil Code; still a foreigner domiciled in France could not sue a foreigner who was not so domiciled, unless the question was one of the performance of an obligation entered into for his benefit since the establishment of his domicile. In certain circumstances the definition of domicile was reduced to that of "principal residence," or "centre of business," and this matter had of late been affected very largely by the case of the Russian refugees, who had been away from Russia for several years and had abandoned the management of their property there, a decision of the Court of Appeal having been given in their favour. The position of a foreigner who possessed a *domicil de facto* without having obtained an authorisation was a very vexed question.

It could not be questioned that a foreigner might have a *domicil de facto*. If he had the centre of his business in France, for instance, he might fix there his principal establishment. Originally the courts were inclined to grant domiciled foreigners certain rights, making their condition very much like that of foreigners domiciled with authorisation; but, beginning about the middle of last century, they limited the effect of non-authorised domicile to matters of jurisdiction, service of writs, and, generally speaking, questions concerning the administration of justice. However, the *domicil de facto* of a foreigner did not produce all the legal effects of a domicile established after a regular authorisation. It was admitted that, where a French subject possessed a domicile abroad, his succession was governed by the foreign law. This had been criticised as to whether the succession to moveables of a foreigner who died when domiciled in France was governed by French law, inasmuch as he had obtained in France the Government's authorisation. As regards French subjects abroad the French Courts recognised such an effect to the mere domicile of fact, and thus, in contradiction of their principles, allowed to the foreign law a competence which they refused to the French law. What was meant by authorised domicile was that the foreigner should fix his residence in France. If after obtaining the authorisation the foreigner should settle abroad, he would soon lose the benefit of the authorisation. A question of considerable importance had lately been raised in connection with Alsace-Lorraine. The Act of 1921, purporting to solve the conflict between the French law and that of Alsace-Lorraine, said nothing about domicile, which was however an important element of the status of persons there. This notion was absolutely discarded, although it should have played an important part in the determination of personal status. It was very well known that no national law might be arrived at when there was no legislative unity. The old French jurists adopted the law of domicile, owing to the multifarious customs prevailing in the realm. Then, in an inter-provincial conflict, the law of domicile should prevail, since it was the law which connected each person with the province of a country. This was the position in Germany in the nineteenth century before their unification of the law. It was the rule of Anglo-Saxon countries in conflicts between the provinces as well as in international conflicts. However, this was not the solution of the 1921 Act concerning Alsace-Lorraine. It should be observed that from the conception then arrived at a two-fold consequence would have ensued. First, persons domiciled in Alsace and Lorraine, including the large number of French people who had gone there from France since the armistice, would have been governed by the local law, without distinction between their origins. Secondly, Alsacians and Lorrainers domiciled in France would have been governed by French law, and not by the local law of Alsace and Lorraine. The Act had established a system both more scientific and more practical. Their status and capacity were regulated by the law of the "community of origin" of the person. A Frenchman by origin, either in Alsace or in Paris, was governed by French law, whereas, Alsacians and Lorrainers were governed by the local law, which was that of their community of origin, again without the slightest consideration of domicile. Knowing the character of domicile, both in French and English law, it seemed more difficult at the present time to discard absolutely the criterion of domicile and its transitory character, which might be rightly applied only to domicile in the continental sense. The outstanding importance of the domicile of origin gave the English principle an unquestionable solidity, which justified its part as the necessary basis of rights in a country where no personal law existed. In France, although nationality was the test of the personal law, domicile should be regarded as a fundamental notion, and, if not a basis of the personal law, it was, as well as nationality, one of the bases of private international law.

In the discussion which followed, Lord Dunedin, Mr. Henriques, K.C., Sir Graham Bower, Professor de Montmorency, and Dr. Bellot took part.

The President moved the adoption of the report of the Executive Committee, and of the accounts, and this was agreed to unanimously.

Mr. Herbert Manisty, K.C., was re-elected President, and Lord Blanesburgh Vice-President. The Executive Committee were elected as follows: Dr. W. R. Bisschop, Mr. J. G. Phillimore, Mr. Wyndham A. Bewes, Mr. William Latey, Master Jelf, Mr. Claude Mullins, Mr. Frank Graham and Dr. Colombos, and Mr. E. J. Schuster, K.C., LL.D., was elected Hon. Treasurer, and Dr. Bellot, Hon. Secretary.

Mr. Cecil Chapman, Metropolitan Police Magistrate, has just retired. Mr. Chapman could have retired some time ago, but at the request of the Home Office he continued to act, and now leaves the Bench on account of advancing years. During his term of office he has served in practically all the courts of the Metropolis.

Stock Exchange Prices of certain Trustee Securities.

Bank Rate 4%. Next London Stock Exchange Settlement, Thursday, 14th August.

	MIDDLE PRICE. 6th Aug.	INTEREST YIELD.
English Government Securities.		
Consols 2½%	57½	4 7 0
War Loan 5% 1920-47	101½	4 19 0
War Loan 4½% 1925-45	96½	4 13 0
War Loan 4% (Tax free) 1920-42	101½	3 18 0
War Loan 3½% 1st March 1928	95½xd	3 13 0
Funding 4% Loan 1960-90	88½	4 10 6
Victory 4% Bonds (available at par for Estate Duty)	93½	4 6 0
Conversion Loan 3½% 1961 or after	77½	4 10 0
Local Loans 3% 1921 or after	65½	4 12 0
India 5½% 15th January 1932	100½	5 9 0
India 4½% 1950-55	86½	5 4 0
India 3½%	66½	5 6 0
India 3%	56½	5 6 0
Colonial Securities.		
British E. Africa 6% 1946-56	113½	5 6 0
South Africa 4% 1943-63	87½xd	4 11 6
Jamaica 4½% 1941-71	95	4 14 0
New South Wales 4½% 1935-45	94½	4 15 0
W. Australia 4½% 1935-65	95	4 14 6
S. Australia 3½% 1926-36	85	4 2 0
New Zealand 4½% 1944	95	4 14 6
New Zealand 4% 1929	95½	4 3 6
Canada 3% 1938	83	3 12 6
Cape of Good Hope 3½% 1929-49	80	4 7 6
Corporation Stocks.		
Ldn. Cty. 2½% Con. Stk. after 1920 at option of Corpn.	54xd	4 12 6
Ldn. Cty. 3% Con. Stk. after 1920 at option of Corpn.	64½xd	4 13 0
Birmingham 3% on or after 1947 at option of Corpn.	65	4 12 6
Bristol 3½% 1925-65	76	4 12 0
Cardiff 3½% 1935	88	3 19 6
Glasgow 2½% 1925-40	75	3 6 6
Liverpool 3½% on or after 1942 at option of Corpn.	77	4 11 0
Manchester 3% on or after 1941	65	4 12 6
Newcastle 3½% irredeemable	76	4 12 0
Nottingham 3% irredeemable	64½	4 13 0
Plymouth 3% 1920-60	69½	4 6 0
Middlesex C.C. 3½% 1927-47	82	4 5 6
English Railway Prior Charges.		
Gt. Western Rly. 4% Debenture	84½	4 14 6
Gt. Western Rly. 5% Rent Charge	103½xd	4 16 6
Gt. Western Rly. 5% Preference	101½	4 18 0
L. North Eastern Rly. 4% Debenture	83	4 16 0
L. North Eastern Rly. 4% Guaranteed	83	4 16 0
L. North Eastern Rly. 4% 1st Preference	82	4 17 6
L. Mid. & Scot. Rly. 4% Debenture	83½	4 15 6
L. Mid. & Scot. Rly. 4% Guaranteed	83½	4 15 6
L. Mid. & Scot. Rly. 4% Preference	82	4 17 6
Southern Railway 4% Debenture	83	4 16 0
Southern Railway 5% Guaranteed	103	4 17 0
Southern Railway 5% Preference	101	4 19 0

Mr. Hugh J. Goolden, 67, Philbeach-gardens, S.W.5, writing to *The Times* (5th inst.), on "Suicide Pacts," says: The wording of the Bill introduced by Brigadier-General Spears for the amendment of the law relating to so-called suicide pacts is a little misleading. It is provided that the survivor of such a pact shall henceforth not "be guilty of wilful murder but . . . shall be guilty of felony." Seeing that murder is in itself a felony, this looks like loose description. Surely some comprehensive term is needed distinctly referable to the new type of crime for which the survivor is to be indicted. Or the charge might always be treated as one of manslaughter. Careless drafting is responsible for many evils.

A Corporate Trustee together with the Family Solicitor

As Adviser assures Efficient Management, Experience and Continuity.

THE ROYAL EXCHANGE ASSURANCE

(Incorporated A.D. 1720) acts as

EXECUTOR AND TRUSTEE OF WILLS or TRUSTEE OF SETTLEMENTS.

Trust Funds are kept apart from the Corporation's Funds.

THE SOLICITOR NOMINATED BY THE TESTATOR IS EMPLOYED.

For full particulars apply to the Secretary—

HEAD OFFICE: ROYAL EXCHANGE, LONDON, E.C.3.
LAW COURTS BRANCH: 29-30, HIGH HOLBORN, W.C.1.

Juries a Hundred Years Ago.

The following is from *The Times* of 1824:—
Monday, 19th July. *Bodkin v. The Proprietors of "The Times"* [Action for libel]. At 18 minutes after 10 the jury entered the Court. Their countenances exhibited all the marks of extreme fatigue. They answered to their names, however, in very firm voices.

Mr. Justice Littledale then asked if they were agreed on their verdict?

The Foreman: We are not agreed; and we are quite as far from agreeing as we were at first. Several of the jury are very ill, and will sink under further exertion.

Mr. Justice Littledale: I have received a letter from Mr. Godsall; has he any observation to make?

Mr. Godsall: My lord, I am extremely ill. I have been confined here from 9 o'clock yesterday morning without refreshment, and I really think my life is in danger . . .

Mr. Robinson said he was near 80 years of age, and extremely ill. He had tasted nothing but a little wine and water since the morning of yesterday. He had been so ill that he did not think he could have held out during the night.

Mr. Justice Littledale: I think it was for you I ordered a sandwich and wine and water?

Mr. Robinson: I had a very little. I am sure I do not know what is to become of us.

Mr. Horton: I am in the same state. I was 80 years of age last April, and I cannot stand this much longer.

Mr. Horn: I am very ill too; my body and mind are both exhausted . . .

Mr. Pain: My lord, we have been consulting all night on the subject of damages.

[After further discussion the jury found themselves able to agree on nominal damages of thirty shillings. They had served exactly 25 hours, and been shut up 19½ hours.]

Tuesday, 20th July. The Verdict in *Bodkin v. "The Times"*.—[Further Particulars.] Immediately after the jury were shut up in the Bail Court the tendency of the alleged libel was warmly discussed . . . The sherry and sandwiches which

Mr. Justice Littledale had permitted to be sent in to Mr. Robertson and Mr. Horton, on account of their advanced age, tended only to excite the appetite of their brother jurors. Mr. Godsall, who, we understand, was engaged to dine with his father-in-law, the Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, seemed particularly to regret the loss of his dinner. . . .

It was a Vauxhall night; and one of the jury attempted to console his fellows by reminding them that at 12 o'clock at night they would have the fireworks at Vauxhall to enlighten their darkness. Twelve o'clock came, but the fireworks, tho' they were heard, were not seen. . . . Mr. Godsall, at this hour of the night, was rather obstreperous. He stamped about the room, in a great passion and committed other extravagancies. . . .

At half-past five Mr. Sawyer, who was the only person that had been able to sleep soundly, awoke, and told his brothers in thralldom that he was as much refreshed by his sleep as if he had taken a meal. . . . To Mr. Godsall [this] proved particularly exasperating; he exhibited symptoms of temporary insanity; he jumped upon a bench and threatened destruction to Mr. Sawyer. . . . He then began to rail with great vehemence against Mr. Sawyer, who had the good sense not to make any answer to his ravings. This appeared to offend him still more: he cried out, "I shall go mad, I shall go mad: he—he" (pointing to Mr. Sawyer) "is cutting my throat with a feather." . . .

He sunk, at last, into a silent melancholy, and was for some time quiet, from complete exhaustion.

The Departure of the American Lawyers.

About a hundred of the American lawyers who have been visiting this country were, says *The Times*, assembled at Waterloo Station last Saturday morning to entrain for Southampton to join the Cunarder "Berengaria."

"You have given us a wonderful reception, and every one of us is going back to the States absolutely in love with all things British," stated Mr. Fell, joint secretary of the American Bar Association. "It will take us a few weeks to get all our ideas sorted out again, and even then we won't be able to tell folks what we really think, because there is nothing with which we can compare this trip. It's without a precedent. The results of the visit are far in advance of what we hoped for, not only in establishing good relations between the two countries, but in giving us an insight into your methods and ideals. The great thing we have learnt is that law is not a business but a profession, and it is something we had been losing sight of."

Mr. Justice Eve and Mr. J. L. Crouch (secretary of the Bar Association's Reception Committee) were among those on the platform to say "Good-bye."

The Postponement of the Law of Property Act.

The following is the text of the Law of Property Act (Postponement) Bill:—
Be it enacted, &c.

1. *Postponement of commencement of 12 & 13 Geo. 5, c. 16.*—The first day of January, nineteen hundred and twenty-six, shall be substituted for the first day of January, nineteen hundred and twenty-five, as the date on which the Law of Property Act, 1922, is to come into operation.

2. *Short Title.*—This Act may be cited as the Law of Property Act (Postponement) Act, 1924.

Legal News.

Dissolutions.

EDWARD TOWNSHEND DRIFFIELD, EDWARD BOWLES DRIFFIELD, RONALD PERCY CLAYTON, and RONALD STEWART-BROWN, Solicitors, 20, Castle-street, Liverpool (Collins, Robinson, Driffield, Clayton & Stewart-Brown), 30th day of June, 1924. [*Gazette*, 1st Aug.]

CECIL HOLDEN and ARTHUR FERNANDES COTTON, Solicitors, 17, Brandon-street, Birkenhead (Cecil Holden and Cotton), 30th day of June, 1924. [*Gazette*, 5th Aug.]

ARTHUR GEORGE JOHNSON, CHARLES EKIN, CHARLES KEELING, and WILLIAM CHARLES COLEMAN GELL, Solicitors, 36, Waterloo-street, Birmingham (Johnson & Company), 30th day of June, 1924. [*Gazette*, 5th Aug.]

General.

Mr. Henry Bell Clayton, of Lenton-avenue, The Park, Nottingham, solicitor, has left estate of gross value £37,791 (net personality £36,005).

Mr. Thomas John Robbins (72), of Eign-road, Hereford, for forty years Sheriff's Officer and Bailiff of the High Court, has left estate of gross value £9,296 (net personality £3,736).

Mr. Ernest William Tame, Town Clerk of Dudley, has been selected for the appointment of Town Clerk of Birkenhead. There were thirty-seven applicants for the position, to which a salary of £1,000 per annum is attached, rising to £2,000 in four years.

A deputation waited upon Mr. Webb, the President of the Board of Trade, on the 24th ult., to inquire what steps his Government proposed to take as to the repayment of the twopence a gallon for milk licences during the war, in view of the rejection of the War Charges Validity Bill by the House of Lords. Mr. Webb assured the deputation that the whole question was now under careful consideration.

A Reuter's message from Edmonton (Alberta), of 26th July, says: Mr. D. L. Scott, the Chief Justice of Alberta, died suddenly at his summer home to-day. Mr. Scott, adds *The Times*, who was born in Scotland in 1845, was appointed Judge of the Supreme

Court of Alberta in 1907, and in 1921 was made Chief Justice. In 1885 he was counsel for the Crown in the State Trials arising out of the North-West Rebellion.

Mr. W. H. Leycester has now recovered from his serious illness, and took his seat at Bow-street Police Court last Saturday for the first time since October last. Mr. St. John Hutchinson, on behalf of the Bar, expressed his delight at seeing him back on the Bench again, and recalled that he was engaged in the last case the magistrate heard before his illness. Mr. Leycester: Yes, you finished me.

Montague Prager, a furrier, of Aldersgate-street, was summoned at the Justice Room, Guildhall, on 31st July, before Alderman Sir William Pryke for neglecting to pay unemployment insurance contributions in respect of three persons in his employment. The defendant pleaded "Guilty," and said he left the stamping of cards in the hands of his cashier, who, it appeared, had neglected his duty. The Magistrate: Under the Act, the duty is yours, and if you delegate it to another person and he fails you, it is you who have to pay the penalty. I must order you to pay arrears amounting to £6 18s. 2d., a fine of £2 on each of the three summonses, and two guineas costs.

Important developments will take place in the provision for law teaching in London as from October next. The Law course have hitherto been entirely in the evening, and have been held at University and King's Colleges, and at the London School of Economics. In addition to the evening courses, there will now be day courses at University College and at the London School of Economics. At the School of Economics the teaching staff in the Faculty of Law has been strengthened by the appointment of Dr. Edward Jenks to the new Chair in English Law, of Mr. Hughes Parry to the new Lectureship in Law, and of Mr. Vernon R. Gattie to lecture on Criminal Law. At University College, the staff has been strengthened by the appointment of Mr. H. F. Jolowicz to lecture on Roman Law and Jurisprudence, and Mr. J. B. Richardson on Equity.

Before the Winchester County Bench on the 1st inst., Lord Northampton was summoned for recklessly driving his motor car at Sutton Scotney, near Winchester, on 10th June. The principal evidence was given by Lord St. Audries, who said he was driving his car along the road and pulled up to let a flock of sheep pass, when Lord Northampton's car came up from behind and dashed into the sheep. Seven of the animals were killed outright, and eleven so badly injured that they had to be slaughtered. The driver appeared to endeavour to pull up, and when spoken to said he did not know anything was on the road. His brake appeared to be hard on. Lord St. Audries estimated that the defendant's speed was forty miles an hour. Lord Northampton did not appear, but wrote to the Bench. A fine of £20 was imposed.

Mr. W. G. Scott-Moncrieff, Whitechurch, Edgware, writing to *The Times* (4th inst.) with reference to the "Honours Case," says: The case concerning the alleged bargain for a knighthood seems to a Scottish lawyer to indicate a serious defect in the English system relating to jury trials. Colonel Parkinson, after a long and expensive trial before a jury, obtained what was practically a verdict in his favour. But the case raised points of law which the Judge, no doubt, in a very sound judgment, has decided against him. The question is, Should there have been a trial of the cause? If the Judge is right, certainly not. In Scotland the trial would have been avoided, because the question of the relevancy of the action would have been decided by the court before the case could have been remitted to a jury. If the contract upon which the plaintiff founded was an illegal one there was no case for a jury to decide.

In the Court of Criminal Appeal, on the 30th ult., says *The Times*, in the case of *Rex v. Roberts*, before the Lord Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Shearman and Mr. Justice Sankey, the court refused the application for leave to appeal against sentence of Bertman Roberts, a postman, who had been convicted at Manchester Assizes of stealing postal packets, and had been sentenced to twelve months' imprisonment with hard labour. Mr. Justice Sankey, in giving the judgment of the court, said that the sentence which had been passed on Roberts was lenient. Fifteen years ago post-office offences were usually visited with sentences of penal servitude, even when they were first offences. Roberts had borne a good character. If he had not had a good character he would not have been employed by the Post Office. He had had a brilliant army service record, but, as the judge at the trial had said, that did not entitle him to commit crime. If it had not been for his record, the sentence would have been a very heavy one, for he had abused a position of trust.

THE MIDDLESEX HOSPITAL.

WHEN CALLED UPON TO ADVISE AS TO LEGACIES, PLEASE DO NOT FORGET THE CLAIMS OF THE MIDDLESEX HOSPITAL, WHICH IS URGENTLY IN NEED OF FUNDS FOR ITS HUMANE WORK.

Sir King Brighton, or be," said the should have strange thing we were still Egypt. It We were extraordinary present Min of prices. building str additional p was no won

VALUATIONS F have a detailed insured, and in (LIMITED), 25, 1 solicitors (not to advise those works of art, bric

Wind

JO

CREDITORS M LIQUIDAT

T

London

NATIONAL ROOF Braemar-st.

LAVINGTON (1010 Old Broad-st.

LONDON BUSINES at 62, Lincol

ESOLY LTD. S E.C.2.

London

FALVEY & PARK Trinity-rd., So

MESSES. RICHAR Stray, 74, Cole

Bank

Lon

ANGELIFFE, CHAR High Court.

APPS, PERCIVAL Portsmouth.

ARMSTRONG, W. Blackburn.

BACKETT, ARTHUR Nottingham.

BOYLING, WALTER Court. Pet. J.

BULMER, CHARLES Sheffield. Pet.

CLIVE, FRANK, turer, Birmingham.

CONSTABLE, CLAU Pet. July 23.

DIMOND, FREDI Manchester.

DIXON, WALTER, Wakefield. Pet.

DOWSE, MARIEL, Ord. July 23.

DRAPE, FREDER Newport, Mon.

EASTMAN, LILIAN Ratton-in-Fur

FREEMAN, JOHN Pet. April 11.

GEMMELL, ALEXA ton-upon-Hull.

GRAMAN, WILLI Greenwich. P.

GRIFFIN, HAROLD Pet. July 4.

HAMPTON, THOM Sweet Dealers.

HARDMAN, FRANK Joiners, Black

HARTLEY, THOMAS Salford. Pet.

HICKLING, JOHN Pet. July 4.

HODGON, GEORGE Manchester. 1

HOLBROOK, WIL Pet. July 21.

HORTON, JOHN July 23. Ord.

IRIS ROBERT, B July 23. Ord.

JOHNSON, HERB Norwich. Pet.

Sir Kingsley Wood, M.P., speaking at the Royal Pavilion, Brighton, on the 3rd inst., on "England in 1940—What it should be," said the solution of the housing problem, and whether we should have a sufficiency of cheap houses fifteen years hence, depended largely on methods of new construction. It was a strange thing, perhaps, that, in spite of all our modern inventions, we were still building practically as they did in Babylon and Egypt. It was a cumbersome and, to-day, costly procedure. We were still trying subsidies to get us the houses. It was an extraordinary fact that half the extra subsidy proposed by the present Minister of Health had already actually gone in increase of prices. It was not unlikely that at the end of the present building strike the whole sum might be absorbed, and not an additional penny would be available for reduction of rents. It was no wonder we turned to other methods.

VALUATIONS FOR INSURANCE.—It is very essential that all Policy Holders should have a detailed valuation of their effects. Property is generally very inadequately insured, and in case of loss insurers suffer accordingly. **DEENHAM STORR & SONS (LIMITED)**, 25, King Street, Covent Garden, W.C.2, the well-known chattel valuers and auctioneers (established over 100 years), have a staff of expert Valuers, and will be glad to advise those desiring valuations for any purpose. Jewels, plate, furs, furniture, works of art, bric-a-brac a speciality. (ADVT.)

EQUITY AND LAW

LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

18, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, LONDON, W.C.2.

ESTABLISHED 1844.

DIRECTORS.

Chairman—Sir Richard Stephens Taylor. Deputy-Chairman—L. W. North Hickey, Esq.

Alexander Diagwall Bateson, Esq., K.C.
Bernard E. H. Bircham, Esq.
Edmund Church, Esq.
Philip G. Collins, Esq.
Harry Milton Crookenden, Esq.
The Rt. Hon. Lord Danesfort.
Robert William Dibdin, Esq.
The Rt. Hon. Lord Ernie, P.C., M.V.O.

Sir John Roger Burrow Gregory.
Archibald Herbert James, Esq.
Alan Ernest Messer, Esq.
Philip G. Collins, Esq.
The Rt. Hon. Lord Phillimore, P.C., D.C.L.
Charles E. Rivington, Esq.
The Hon. Sir Charles Russell, Bart., K.C.V.O.
Sir Francis Mordaunt Vowles, C.B.E.
Charles Wigan, Esq.

FUNDS EXCEED £5,578,000.

All classes of Life Assurance Granted. Whole Life and Endowment Assurances without profits, at exceptionally low rates of premium.

W. P. PHELPS, Manager.

Winding-up Notices.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

CREDITORS MUST SEND IN THEIR CLAIMS TO THE LIQUIDATOR AS NAMED ON OR BEFORE THE DATE MENTIONED.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, August 1.

NATIONAL ROOFINGS LTD. Sept. 8. Frank Dowler, 33, Bransford-st., Manchester.
LAVINGTON (1916) LTD. Aug. 30. F. B. Wilson, 4, Union-st., Old Broad-st.
LONDON BUSINESS PREMISES LTD. Sept. 1. W. H. Chantrey, 61 & 62, Lincoln's Inn-fields.
ENGLIS LTD. Sept. 15. Sydney Jeffreys, 10, Coleman-st., E.C.2.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, August 5.

FALVEY & PARKER LTD. Aug. 7. Alfred J. Gregory, 37, Trinity-rd., Southall, Mdx.
MESSRS. RICHARDSON & SONS LTD. Aug. 18. A. Mellors Stray, 74, Coleman-st., E.C.2.

Bankruptcy Notices.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, July 25.

ANGLIFFE, CHARLES W., Archer-st., Great Windmill-st., High Court. Pet. June 25. Ord. July 22.
APPS, PERCIVAL B., North End, Portsmouth. Fitter. Portsmouth. Pet. July 21. Ord. July 21.
ARMSTRONG, W., Playthorne, nr. Glaburn, Poultry Farmer. Blackburn. Pet. July 1. Ord. July 21.
BARKETT, ARTHUR C. R., Nottingham, Electrical Engineer. Nottingham. Pet. July 21. Ord. July 21.
BOULTON, WALTER, New Broad-st., Financier. High Court. Pet. June 5. Ord. July 22.
BULMER, CHARLES, and HELM, TOM R., Doncaster, Tailors. Sheffield. Pet. July 23. Ord. July 23.
CLEWS, FRANK, Birmingham, Aluminium Goods Manufacturer, Birmingham. Pet. July 22. Ord. July 22.
CONSTABLE, CLAUDE H., Darlington, General Dealer. Walsall. Pet. July 23. Ord. July 23.
DIXON, FREDERICK, Manchester, Carling Contractor. Manchester. Pet. July 22. Ord. July 22.
DIXON, WALTER, and DIXON, ANN, Pontefract, Drysalers. Wakefield. Pet. July 23. Ord. July 23.
DOWSE, MARCEL, Westhoughton, Bolton. Pet. July 7. Ord. July 23.
DRAPE, FREDERICK W., Lydney, Glouc., Blacksmith. Newport, Mon. Pet. July 22. Ord. July 22.
BARTON, LILLIAN D., Barrow-in-Furness, General Dealer. Barrow-in-Furness. Pet. July 22. Ord. July 22.
FREEMAN, JOHN L., Crownhill, nr. Plymouth. Plymouth. Pet. April 11. Ord. July 21.
GEMMELL, ALEXANDER, Kingston-upon-Hull, Joiner. Kingston-upon-Hull. Pet. July 19. Ord. July 19.
GRAMAN, WILLIAM F., Sydenham, Insurance Clerk. Greenwich. Pet. July 22. Ord. July 22.
GRIFFIN, HAROLD G., Birmingham, Coal Merchant, Birmingham. Pet. July 22. Ord. July 22.
HAMPTON, THOMAS S., and HAMPTON, GLADYS, Blackpool, Sweet Dealers. Blackpool. Pet. July 22. Ord. July 22.
HARDMAN, FRANK, and POOLE, EDGAR, St. Anne-on-Sea, Joiners. Blackpool. Pet. July 19. Ord. July 19.
HARTLEY, THOMAS H., Chorlton-cum-Hardy, Yarn Salesman. Salford. Pet. July 22. Ord. July 22.
HURKING, JOHN W., Eastwood, Notts., Traveller. Derby. Pet. July 4. Ord. July 21.
HOBBS, GEORGE, Blackley, Manchester, Haulage Contractor. Manchester. Pet. July 23. Ord. July 23.
HOLDROCK, WILLIAM E., Bristol, Tobaccoconist. Bristol. Pet. July 21. Ord. July 21.
HORTON, JOHN W., Marlborough, Baker. Swindon. Pet. July 23. Ord. July 23.
JEN, ROBERT, Bishops Castle, Farmer. Leominster. Pet. July 23. Ord. July 23.
JOHNSON, HERBERT A., Norwich, Commercial Traveller. Norwich. Pet. July 1. Ord. July 21.

JONES, EDWARD D., Ashford Carbonell, Builder. Leominster. Pet. July 21. Ord. July 21.
KENSLEY, BERTRAM R., Sittingbourne, Horse Dealer. Rochester. Pet. July 22. Ord. July 22.
MCLEOD, JOHN S., Bolton, Engineer. Bolton. Pet. July 16. Ord. July 16.
NIXON, JAMES S., Charing Cross-rd., Building Contractor. High Court. Pet. Feb. 4. Ord. July 22.
PHILLIPS, ARTHUR J., Llangollen, Salesman. Wrexham. Pet. May 7. Ord. July 22.
POWELL, ELIZABETH A., Pengam, Draper. Merthyr Tydfil. Pet. July 23. Ord. July 23.
PRINCE ANDREW OF RUSSIA, Hanover Gate, Club Proprietor. High Court. Pet. April 30. Ord. July 22.
RDGWAY, SAMUEL, Blackpool, Butcher. Blackpool. Pet. June 30. Ord. July 18.
RIVETT, HARRY, Leeds, Mechanic. Leeds. Pet. July 23. Ord. July 23.
ROBINSON, CHARLES L., Northampton, Leather Merchant. Northampton. Pet. June 28. Ord. July 22.
ROOKE, LEWIS, Bradford, Master Tailor. Northallerton. Pet. July 21. Ord. July 21.
RUSHGROVE, EDMUND G., Bromyard, Smallholder. Worcester. Pet. July 19. Ord. July 19.
SMITH JOHN G., Walsall, Fancy Leather Goods Manufacturer. Walsall. Pet. July 21. Ord. July 21.
SMITH, MARY A., Gifford-st., Engineers. High Court. Pet. July 21. Ord. July 21.
STORR, JOHN G. W., Fisherman, Great Grimsby. Pet. July 23. Ord. July 23.
THOMAS, MARY, New Quay, Cardigan. Aberystwyth. Pet. July 23. Ord. July 23.
THOMPSON, JAMES, Halifax, Coal Dealer. Halifax. Pet. July 21. Ord. July 21.
TOWNSEND, HAROLD, Leicester, Boot Dealer. Leicester. Pet. July 23. Ord. July 23.
TURNER, HERBERT, Slaithwaite, Horse Dealer. Huddersfield. Pet. July 23. Ord. July 23.
WALKER, ARTHUR, Leeds, Gas Regulator. Leeds. Pet. July 18. Ord. July 18.
WALKER, GEORGE H., Sea View, Isle of W., Builder. Newport. Pet. July 22. Ord. July 22.
WATTS, THOMAS, Hardingsone, Northampton, Grocer. Northampton. Pet. July 21. Ord. July 21.
WELCH, GEORGE R., Gloucester, Wine and Spirit Dealer. Gloucester. Pet. July 18. Ord. July 18.
WEST, HENRY D., Kelghley, Chemist. Bradford. Pet. July 23. Ord. July 23.
WHITE, ERIC, Stoke-on-Trent, Schoolmaster. Hanley. Pet. July 21. Ord. July 21.
WILKINSON, RACHEL, Pankirk, Northampton, Motor Bus Proprietor. Peterborough. Pet. July 9. Ord. July 18.
WILLIAMS, FREDERICK, Helston, Miller. Truro. Pet. July 22. Ord. July 22.

Amended Notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of July 18, 1924:—
FERRIAM, FORTUNATUS R. H. Falmouth, Licensed Victualler. Truro. Pet. July 16. Ord. July 16.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, July 29.

ADAMS, CHARLES H., Kettering, Butcher. Northampton. Pet. July 25. Ord. July 25.
BARRELL, JAMES H., Aston, Birmingham, Estate Agent. Birmingham. Pet. June 25. Ord. July 24.
BATES, HERBERT R., Merton, Confectioner. Kingston. Pet. July 25. Ord. July 25.
BIRD FILM COMPANY, Shaftesbury-av., Film Producers. High Court. Pet. July 10. Ord. July 24.
BITTLE, FRANCES V., Malpas, Chester, Farmer. Nantwich. Pet. July 24. Ord. July 24.
BURGESS, JAMES E., Bolton upon Dearne, Yorks, Grocer. Sheffield. Pet. July 25. Ord. July 25.
CARTER, THOMAS, Hothorpe, Derby, Retail Butcher. Sheffield. Pet. July 24. Ord. July 24.
CHISHOLM, WILLIAM J., Tottenham, Pianoforte Manufacturer. Edmonton. Pet. July 1. Ord. July 23.
CLARKE, WALTER, Hayfield, Poultry Farmer. Stockport. Pet. July 8. Ord. July 24.
COOPER, ALFRED J., Arkholme, Lanes, Fruit and Fish Dealer. Kendal. Pet. July 25. Ord. July 25.
COUSINS, CHARLES W., Judd-st., King's Cross, Confectioner. High Court. Pet. July 24. Ord. July 24.
DAVIES, JOHN T., Bettws, Montgomery, Innkeeper. Newtown. Pet. June 25. Ord. July 25.
DEAN, THOMAS, Llanelli, China Dealer. Carmarthen. Pet. July 26. Ord. July 26.

EVERTON, THOMAS R., Manchester, Hat Manufacturer. Manchester. Pet. July 26. Ord. July 26.
EVETT, GEORGE A., Stafford, Bread Checker. Stafford. Pet. July 24. Ord. July 24.
FENTON, JOSEPH, York, Licensed Victualler. York. Pet. July 18. Ord. July 23.
GALE, HERBERT R., Worthing, Bank Clerk. Brighton. Pet. July 24. Ord. July 24.
GRAY, CECIL O., Edgware, Dental Surgeon. High Court. Pet. June 4. Ord. July 23.
GRAY, FRED, Dukinfield, Chester, Pork Butcher. Ashton-under-Lyne. Pet. July 14. Ord. July 24.
GREGSON, C. E., Bangor, Film Hirer. Bangor. Pet. May 14. Ord. July 25.
HAMELIN, ROLAND P., Ashton Vale, Bristol, Haulier. Bristol. Pet. July 26. Ord. July 26.
HEY, FRED, Salford, Insurance Agent. Salford. Pet. July 1. Ord. July 25.
HOPMAN, CHARLES G., South Lambeth-rd., Electrical Engineer. High Court. Pet. July 25. Ord. July 25.
HUBBARD, FRANK A., Durham, Organ Pipe Manufacturer. Durham. Pet. July 24. Ord. July 24.
JACQUES, JOHN, Anerley, Commercial Traveller. High Court. Pet. July 25. Ord. July 25.
JOHNSON, HARRY J., Horley, Surrey, Builder. Croydon. Pet. April 4. Ord. July 24.
JONES, GEORGE P., Pontre, Wholesale Confectioner. Pontypridd. Pet. July 24. Ord. July 24.
MASON, ALBERT, and WINDOW, ARTHUR C., Barton-upon-Humber, Cinematograph and Music Hall Proprietors. Great Grimsby. Pet. July 26. Ord. July 26.
MATTHEWS, ALFRED W., and MATTHEWS, FREDERICK G., Engineers. Sheffield. Pet. July 24. Ord. July 24.
NEW, HENRY W., Windsor, Coachbuilder. Windsor. Pet. July 25. Ord. July 25.
OWEN, JOHN, Llanachlarn, Sett Maker. Portmadoc. Pet. July 25. Ord. July 25.
PAYNE, GILBERT, Theatrical Producer. Leeds. Pet. July 25. Ord. July 25.
PEARSE, FREDERICK J., Brompton-rd., Maker of Electric Light Fittings. High Court. Pet. June 6. Ord. July 24.
POULSON, A. L., Buckenbury, Chemist. High Court. Pet. June 4. Ord. July 17.
ROSSITER, OLIVER J., Weston-super-Mare, Grocer. Bridgewater. Pet. July 25. Ord. July 25.
ROWLAND, RICHARD, Mumbles, Swansea, Storekeeper. Swansea. Pet. July 24. Ord. July 24.
SEVERN, W. H., South-st., Thurlow-sq. High Court. Pet. May 20. Ord. July 24.
SEYMOUR, FRANK K., Merthyr Vale, Cinema Lessee. Merthyr Tydfil. Pet. July 24. Ord. July 24.
SINCLAIR, STAFFORD, Salford, Engineer. Salford. Pet. July 1. Ord. July 25.
STEWART, FREDERICK J., W., Cornwall-gdns. High Court. Pet. June 27. Ord. July 24.
STEWART, SIR NORMAN, Ealing. Brentford. Pet. May 9. Ord. July 24.
STIRK, RUTH, and STIRK, GEORGE H., Grocers. York. Pet. July 23. Ord. July 23.
WALLACE, F. G., Birkdale, Garage Proprietor. Liverpool. Pet. July 3. Ord. July 25.
WARD, HERBERT G., Wimbledon. Kingston. Pet. June 20. Ord. July 24.
WATSON, CHRISTOPHER, Littleborough, Cotton Operative. Rochdale. Pet. July 26. Ord. July 26.
WILD, ALWYN H., Sheffield. High Court. Pet. May 27. Ord. July 24.
WILSON, J. A., Charing Cross-rd. High Court. Pet. May 5. Ord. June 20.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, August 1.

ASHBY, JOHN W., Tonbridge, Newsagent. Tunbridge Wells. Pet. July 30. Ord. July 30.
BENHAM, CHARLES W., Eastbourne, Tobaccoconist. Eastbourne. Pet. July 30. Ord. July 30.
BRYANT, RICHARD W., Chippenham, Dairyman. Bath. Pet. July 29. Ord. July 29.
BURKETT, JAMES, South Shields, Electrical Engineer. Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Pet. July 29. Ord. July 29.
CALDWELL, Capt. J., Wellington College, Berks. Reading. Pet. March 25. Ord. July 29.
CAMPBELL, ARTHUR, Manchester, Accountant. Manchester. Pet. July 1. Ord. July 28.
CARWARDINE, EDWARD, Hove, Shop Fitter. Brighton. Pet. July 14. Ord. July 29.
COWAN, JAMES, Manchester, Merchant. Manchester. Pet. July 29. Ord. July 29.

DAWKINS, THOMAS, Kettering, Confectioner. Northampton. Pet. July 28. Ord. July 28.
 DUNS, ROBERT, Morpeth, Licensed Victualler. Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Pet. July 28. Ord. July 28.
 FREEDMAN, YETTA, Clerkenwell, Draper. High Court. Pet. July 28. Ord. July 28.
 FEYR, JOHN R., Kensington. High Court. Pet. June 12. Ord. July 29.
 GOULD, ARTHUR, Kingston-upon-Hull, Butcher. Kingston-upon-Hull. Pet. July 28. Ord. July 28.
 HYTER, CHARLES, St. Helens, Licensed Victualler. Liverpool. Pet. July 29. Ord. July 29.
 HOLKER, GREVILLE, Darwen, Draper. Blackburn. Pet. July 30. Ord. July 30.
 HOLMES, GEORGE, Sheffield, Printer. Sheffield. Pet. July 28. Ord. July 28.
 HOLMES, SIDNEY, Leeds, Electrical Engineer. Leeds. Pet. July 28. Ord. July 28.
 ISTER, JAMES S., Portsmouth, Furniture Dealer. Portsmouth. Pet. June 28. Ord. July 28.
 JAMES, WILLIAM R., Wollacastle, Farmer. Haverfordwest. Pet. June 21. Ord. July 28.
 JESSOP, JOSEPH, Leicester, Motor Engineer. Leicester. Pet. July 29. Ord. July 29.
 JOHNSON, S. W., Mincing-lane. High Court. Pet. May 8. Ord. July 30.
 JONES, WILLIAM, Holloway, Showman. High Court. Pet. June 5. Ord. July 30.
 KRAEHNICK, RUBIN, Stoke Newington-rd., Ladies' Under-clothing Manufacturer. High Court. Pet. July 7. Ord. July 30.
 LATHAM, JOSEPH, Stanningley, Tailor. Bradford. Pet. July 29. Ord. July 29.
 LEWIS, S. HOPE, Manchester. Manchester. Pet. June 26. Ord. July 28.
 MAGUIRE, HARRY, Kingston-upon-Hull, Company Director. Kingston-upon-Hull. Pet. July 28. Ord. July 28.
 MERRHAM, WILLIAM, Liverpool. Liverpool. Pet. July 9. Ord. July 30.
 MILNE, ROBERT, Shaw, Minder. Oldham. Pet. July 29. Ord. July 29.
 MOSE, ALFRED, Bradford, Licensed Victualler. Bradford. Pet. July 28. Ord. July 28.
 PARKIN, CHARLES R., Great Grimsby, General Dealer. Great Grimsby. Pet. July 29. Ord. July 29.
 POMEROY, SIDNEY, Plymouth, Dairyman. Plymouth. Pet. July 17. Ord. July 28.
 PUGH, JOHN, and BAILEY, ABOLSON, Darlaston, Colliery Proprietors. Walsall. Pet. July 30. Ord. July 30.
 RAMSEY, ROBERT, and RAMSEY, RICHARD, Sheffield, General Dealers. Sheffield. Pet. July 28. Ord. July 28.
 STOREY, WILLIAM E., Doncaster, Boot Dealer and Insurance Agent. Sheffield. Pet. July 8. Ord. July 28.
 RIDGE, MATTHEW W., Wedmore, Saddler. Wells. Pet. July 30. Ord. July 30.
 ROBINSON, FRANK E., Milk-st., Woolen Merchant. High Court. Pet. July 8. Ord. July 28.
 ROGERS & BOYER, Regent-st., W., Oil Distributing Contractors. High Court. Pet. April 25. Ord. July 24.
 SHORT, BARTON M., West Hartlepool, Haulage Contractor. Sunderland. Pet. July 28. Ord. July 28.
 SQUIRES, CECIL, Radford, Notts, Grocer. Nottingham. Pet. July 28. Ord. July 28.
 STRIBLING, LESLIE N., and SUTTERFIELD, ALBERT R., Margate, Electrical Engineers. Canterbury. Pet. July 30. Ord. July 30.
 THOMPSON, WILLIAM A., Hinckley, Motor Engineer. Leicester. Pet. July 28. Ord. July 28.
 TOWN, A. V., Hampstead. High Court. Pet. July 4. Ord. July 25.
 TURNER, DAVID, West Bromwich, Art Metal Manufacturer. West Bromwich. Pet. July 29. Ord. July 29.
 WADSWORTH, ARTHUR E., Rochdale, Taxi Proprietor. Rochdale. Pet. July 30. Ord. July 30.
 WHEELER, CHARLES S., Portsmouth, Confectioner. Portsmouth. Pet. July 30. Ord. July 30.
 WHITE, MARCEL, and WHITE, LIZBIE, Stafford, Milliners. Stafford. Pet. July 8. Ord. July 28.
 WHITEMAN, WILLIAM, Upper Peeding, Sussex, Builder. Brighton. Pet. July 11. Ord. July 29.
 WILD, JOSEPH L., Manchester, Cotton Salesman. Manchester. Pet. July 1. Ord. July 28.
 WILLIAMS, VICTOR H., and WILLIAMS, ALBERT E., Mold, General Dealers. Chester. Pet. July 29. Ord. July 29.
 WING, THOMAS, Saxmundham, Farmer. Ipswich. Pet. July 24. Ord. July 24.
 WISE, LILLY M., Farnham, Boarding-house Keeper. Guildford. Pet. June 30. Ord. July 29.
 WORMALL, WALTER, Sheffield, Grocer. Sheffield. Pet. July 28. Ord. July 28.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, August 5.

ABBEY, FRANK C., Alington, Exeter, Poultry Farmer. Exeter. Pet. July 29. Ord. July 29.
 ARBOLD, ARBOLD K., Sloane-sq., Auctioneer. High Court. Pet. July 31. Ord. July 31.
 ASHLEY, FRANK, Wellington, Boot Repairer. Northampton. Pet. Aug. 1. Ord. Aug. 1.
 BRENN, JACOB, Leman-st., Bespoke Tailor. High Court. Pet. July 23. Ord. Aug. 1.
 BROWN, FRED, Nottingham, Licensed Victualler. Nottingham. Pet. July 15. Ord. July 31.
 BRECKWICK, PAUL, Chester, Dentist. Chester. Pet. July 31. Ord. July 31.
 CLARKE, ISAAC, Poultrick, Hereford, Engineer. Hereford. Pet. Aug. 1. Ord. Aug. 1.
 COOPER, FREDERICK, Derby, Goods Porter. Derby. Pet. July 31. Ord. July 31.
 DAVIDSON, SAMUEL F., Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Contractor. Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Pet. July 31. Ord. July 31.
 DIXON, CHARLES L. A., Burton Joyce, Notts, Advertisement Contractor. Nottingham. Pet. July 31. Ord. July 31.
 ENSMOTT, CHARLES, Shipley, Furniture Dealer. Bradford. Pet. Aug. 1. Ord. Aug. 1.
 FEENE, CHARLES, Pudsey, Market Gardener. Bradford. Pet. July 31. Ord. July 31.
 FRYER, TOM, Foulridge, near Colne, Cotton Salesman. Burnley. Pet. May 21. Ord. July 29.

GASKELL, JAMES, Edgeley, Stockport, Coal Merchant. Stockport. Pet. Aug. 1. Ord. Aug. 1.
 GAUDIN, JOHN, Worthing, Builder. Brighton. Pet. July 31. Ord. July 31.
 GORDON, JACOB, Marthyr Tydfil, Draper. Marthyr Tydfil. Pet. Aug. 1. Ord. Aug. 1.
 HEATH, EDWARD F., Wandsworth, Wandsworth. Pet. July 3. Ord. July 31.
 HODGSON, HARRIETTE E., Crewe, Confectioner. Nantwich. Pet. Aug. 1. Ord. Aug. 1.
 HOPWOOD, JAMES E., Mottram St. Andrew, Chester, Teacher of Music. Macclesfield. Pet. July 31. Ord. July 31.
 JACKSON, LIEUT. B. H. HOLMES, Egypt. High Court. Pet. March 28. Ord. July 30.
 JAKEMAN, WILLIAM H., Dudley, Builder. Dudley. Pet. July 11. Ord. July 31.
 JEAONS, JOHN A., Brierley Hill, Heating Apparatus and Fencing Dealer. Stourbridge. Pet. July 28. Ord. July 28.
 KOBAN, CHARLES M., Farrars Buildings, Temple. High Court. Pet. March 20. Ord. July 30.
 LAURANCE, WILLIAM, Amesbury, Wilts, Contractor. Salisbury. Pet. July 18. Ord. July 31.
 LOUFAIN, M., Houndsditch, Merchant. High Court. Pet. July 17. Ord. July 30.
 MARRO, SYDNEY, Glasshouse-st. High Court. Pet. June 13. Ord. July 30.
 MCKENNEY, H. S., Leatherhead, Builder. Croydon. Pet. June 19. Ord. July 31.
 NYSSON, MATILDA, Newark, Draper. Nottingham. Pet. July 16. Ord. July 31.
 OWEN, HERBERT R., Newtown, Montgomery, Saddler. Newtown. Pet. July 31. Ord. July 31.
 PAYNE, L. A., Crawley, Builder. Brighton. Pet. April 25. Ord. Aug. 1.
 RAWLEY, ROBERT, Gray's Inn-rd., Goldleaf Merchant. High Court. Pet. July 31. Ord. July 31.
 REARDEN, JAMES A., Liverpool, Barrister-at-Law. Liverpool. Pet. July 8. Ord. Aug. 1.
 RICHARDS, ERNEST F., Minchinhampton, Builder. Gloucester. Pet. Aug. 1. Ord. Aug. 1.
 RIGBY, WILLIAM, Crewe, Tailor. Nantwich. Pet. Aug. 1. Ord. Aug. 1.
 RITTER, ALFRED, Stepney-green. High Court. Pet. July 11. Ord. July 31.
 ROURE, FLORENCE, Darlington, Draper. Stockton-on-Tees. Pet. July 30. Ord. July 31.
 SHAW, JOSEPH A., Stafford, Musical Instrument Dealer. Stafford. Pet. July 31. Ord. July 31.
 SMITH, WILLIAM J., Great Yarmouth. Great Yarmouth. Pet. July 11. Ord. Aug. 1.
 STEEL, ARTHUR E., High Holborn. High Court. Pet. June 6. Ord. July 31.
 TALLERMAN, EDWARD, Kingston-upon-Hull, Glass, China and Hardware Dealer. Kingston-upon-Hull. Pet. July 2. Ord. Aug. 1.
 TAYLOR, HENRY M., Leigh, Lancs, Grocer. Bolton. Pet. July 31. Ord. July 31.
 TURNER, JOSEPH, Halifax, Plumber. Halifax. Pet. Aug. 1. Ord. Aug. 1.
 VAN KUYLENBURG, ALLAN, Horse-heath, Cambridge. High Court. Pet. March 25. Ord. July 31.

TO BOTH BRITISH AND AMERICAN SERVICE AND EX-SERVICE MEN OF ALL RANKS.

Visit your comrades of "THE GREAT SACRIFICE," and help to further the Work and Ministry which is dedicated to "THEM," and show the Empire and the World at large that the war has taught you that CHRISTIANITY is something much more Noble and Beautiful, something broader and more Manly than hitherto taught.
MEN! your COMRADES IN ARMS laid down their LIVES for YOU—Are YOU going to let their memory fade?
The Pro-Cathedral of "The Great Sacrifice,"
21, MAIDEN LANE, COVENT GARDEN, W.C.2.

READY NEXT WEEK.

NEW EDITION. Completely Up to Date.

Price 7s. 6d. By Post 8s.

A GUIDE

TO

THE RENT & MORTGAGE INTEREST RESTRICTIONS ACTS, 1920 to 1924.

BY

W. E. WILKINSON, LL.D. (Lond.),
 A Solicitor of the Supreme Court.

The changes in the Law made by the Prevention of Eviction Act, 1924, are clearly shown.

THE SOLICITORS' LAW STATIONERY SOCIETY, LTD.,

22, CHANCERY LANE, W.C.2.

27-28, WALBROOK, E.C.4. 6, VICTORIA ST., S.W.1.
 49, BEDFORD ROW, W.C.1. 15, HAMOVER ST., W.1.

THE SOLICITORS' LAW STATIONERY SOCIETY, LIMITED, LAW PUBLISHERS, BOOKSELLERS, AND PRINTERS.

READY NEXT WEEK.

A GUIDE TO THE RENT AND MORTGAGE INTEREST RESTRICTIONS ACTS, 1920 to 1924.

A complete exposition with the Text of the Acts (including the Repealed Acts) and the Rules. Fourth Edition. By W. E. WILKINSON, LL.D. (Lond.), Solicitor. Price 7s. 6d. net, or by post, 8s.

NOTES ON PERUSING TITLES,

Incorporating the Law of Property Act, 1922 (the provisions of which have been dissected and allocated to their proper headings in the text, thus showing the old and the new law in contrast), including a Scheme for the Study of the Act and Explanatory Notes on the Specimen Abstracts given in the Act. By LEWIS E. EMMET, Solicitor. Tenth Edition. Royal 8vo, 816 pp., Cloth. Price 40s. net; or by post, 41s.

New System of BOOK-KEEPING for SOLICITORS.

An absolutely self-checking system. By LEWIS E. EMMET, Solicitor. Price 4s. 6d., or by post, 5s.

Handbook giving

TABLES OF ESTATE, PROBATE, STAMP & COMPANIES' DUTIES, and Registration Fees in various Offices, with Notes as to Forms and Official Requirements. By T. A. SEABROOK. Price 5s., or by post, 5s. 5d.

Treatise on the

CONVERSION of a BUSINESS into a PRIVATE LIMITED COMPANY,

with annotated Forms of Memorandum and Articles of Association and other Documents, and some observations on Reduction of Capital. Fourth Edition. By CECIL W. TURNER, of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law. Price 10s., or by post, 10s. 6d.

THE SOLICITORS' DAY SHEET DIARY for 1924.

A combination of Diary, Day Sheet and Day Book, made up in quarterly parts. Price for remaining two quarters 6s. 3d., or carriage free, 7s. 3d.

Specimen sheet on application.

The whole Statute Law of Companies and Bankruptcy in handy form bound up with copious indices and Tables showing where the corresponding sections of the repealed Acts are to be found in the Consolidated Acts and vice versa:—

THE COMPANIES ACTS, 1908-17.

Seventh Edition. As above, by CECIL W. TURNER, of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law. Price 8s. 6d. net, or by post, 9s.

THE BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1914.

As above, by CECIL W. TURNER, of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law. Price 3s. 6d. net, or by post, 4s.

22, CHANCERY LANE, W.C.2.

27-28, WALBROOK, E.C.4. 49, Bedford Row, W.C.1.
 6, Victoria Street, S.W.1. 15, Hamover Street, W.1.